National Anti-Slavery Standard.

SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, Editor. Without Concealment---Without Compromise. EDMUND QUINCY, JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL, } Corresponding Editors.

VOL. X.---NO. 38. NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1850. WHOLE NUMBER 506.

Published Weekly,
BY THE
AMERICAN A. S. SOCIETY,
At 142 Nassau Street, New-York.

Terms,
TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM.

☞ All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns, should be addressed to S. H. Gay, New York.

☞ Donations to the Treasury of the American Anti-Slavery Society may be forwarded to Francis Jackson, Treasurer, at Boston; or S. H. Gay, New-York.

NORRIS, PRINTER.

Selections.

A REPLY TO MR. CARLYLE.

Fraser's Magazine, in which Mr. Carlyle's Paper on the Negroes, appeared, contains in the January Number a Reply from another contributor, so masterly and so decisive of the question at issue, and at the same time so full of just and noble thought, that our readers, we feel sure, will thank us for giving to it a large portion of our space. With some of the criticisms we do not altogether agree; but instead of appending any commentary, we think it better to leave the whole to the judgment of our readers. We may add, that this paper has been attributed to a writer of the highest scientific and literally eminence.—*London Inquirer.*

THE NEGRO QUESTION.

To the Editor of Fraser's Magazine:—Sir,—Your last month's Number contains a speech against the "rights of Negroes," the doctrines and spirit of which ought not to pass without remonstrance. The author issues his opinions, or rather ordinances, under imposing auspices: no less than those of "the immortal gods." "The powers," "the destinies," announce through him, not only what will be, but what shall be done; what they "have decided upon, passed their eternal act of parliament for." This is speaking "as one having authority;" but authority from whom? If by the quality of the message we may judge of those who sent it, not from any powers to whom just or good men acknowledge allegiance. This so-called "eternal act of parliament" is no new law, but the old law of the strongest.—a law against which the great teachers of mankind have in all ages protested; it is the law of force and cunning; the law that whoever is more powerful than another, is "born lord" of that other, the other being born his "servant," who must be "compelled to work" for him by "beneficent whip," if "other methods avail not." I see nothing divine in this injunction. If "the gods" will this, it is the first duty of human beings to resist such gods. Omnipotent these "gods" are not, for powers which demand tyranny and injustice cannot accomplish their purpose unless human beings coöperate. The history of human improvement is the record of a struggle, by which inch after inch of ground has been wrung from these maleficent powers, and more and more of human life rescued from the iniquitous dominion of the law of might. Much, very much of this work still remains to do; but the progress made in it is the best and greatest achievement yet performed by mankind, and it was hardly to be expected at this period of the world that we should be enjoined, by way of a great reform in human affairs, to begin undoing it.

The age, it appears, is ill with a most pernicious disease, which infects all its proceedings, and of which the conduct of this country in regard to the Negroes is a prominent symptom—the disease of philanthropy. "Sunk in deep froth-oceans of benevolence, fraternity emancipation-principle, Christian philanthropy, and other most amiable-looking, but most baseless, and, in the end, baleful and all-bewildering jargon," the product of "hearts left destitute of any earnest guidance, and djebelieving that there ever was any, Christian or heathen," the "human species" is "reduced to believe in rose-pink sentimentalism alone." On this alleged condition ot the human species I shall have something to say presently. But I must first set my anti-philanthropic opponent right on a matter of fact. He entirely misunderstands the great national revolt of the conscience of this country against Slavery and the slave-trade, if he supposes it to have been an affair of sentiment. It depended no more on humane feelings than any cause which so irresistibly appealed to them must necessarily do. Its first victories were gained while the lash yet ruled uncontested in the barrack-yard and the rod in schools, and while men were still hanged by dozens for stealing to the value of forty shillings. It triumphed because it was the cause of justice; and, in the estimation of the great majority of its supporters, of religion. Its originators and leaders were persons of a stern sense of moral obligation, who, in the spirit of the religion, of their time, seldom spoke much of benevolence and philanthropy but often of duty, crime, and sin. For nearly two centuries had Negroes, many thousands annually, been seized by force or treachery, and carried off to the West Indies to be worked to death; for it was the received maxim, the acknowledged dictate of good economy, to wear them out quickly and import more. In this fact every other possible cruelty, tyranny, and wanton oppression was by implication included. And the motive on the part of the slave-owners was the love of gold; or, to speak more truly, of vulgar and puerile ostentation. I have yet to learn that anything more detestable than this has been done by human beings towards human beings in any part of the earth. It is a mockery to talk of comparing it with Ireland. And this went on, not, like Irish beggary, because England had not the skill to prevent it,—not merely by the sufferance, but by the laws of the English nation. At last, however, there were found men, in growing number, who determined not to rest until the iniquity was extirpated; who made the destruction of it as much the business and end of their lives as ordinary men make their private interests; who would not be content with softening its hideous features, and making it less intolerable to the sight, but would stop at nothing short of its utter and irrevocable extinction. I am so far from seeing anything contemptible in this resolution, that, in my sober opinion, the persons who formed and executed it deserve to be numbered among those, not numerous in any age who have led noble lives according to their lights, and laid on mankind a debt of permanent gratitude.

After fifty years of toil and sacrifice. the object was accomplished, and the Negroes, freed from the despotism of their fellow-beings, were left to themselves, and to the chances which the arrangements of existing society provide for those who have no resource but their labor. These chances proved favorable to them, and for the last ten years, they afford the unusual spectacle of a laboring class whose labor bears so high a price that they can exist in comfort on the wages of a comparatively small quantity of work This, to the ex-slave-owners, is an inconvenience; but I have not yet heard that any of them has been reduced to beg his bread, or even to dig for it, as the Negro, however scandalously he enjoys himself, still must: a carriage or some other luxury the less, is in most cases, I believe, the limit of their privations—no very hard measure of retributive justice; those who have had tyrannical power taken away from them, may think themselves fortunate if they come so well off; at all events, it is an embarrassment out of which the nation is not called on to help them; if they cannot continue to realize their large incomes without more laborers, let them find them and bring them from where they can best be procured, only not by force. Not so thinks your anti-philanthropic contributor. That Negroes should exist, and enjoy existence, on so little work. is a scandal in his eyes worse than their former Slavery. It must be put a stop to at any price. He does not "wish to see" them slaves again "if it can be avoided;" but "decidedly" they "will have to be servants" "servants to the whites." "compelled to labor," and "not to go idle another minute." "Black Quashee," "up to the ears in pumpkins," and "working about half an hour a day," is to him the abomination of abominations. I have so serious a quarrel with him about principles, that I have no time to spare for his facts; but let me remark, how easily he takes for granted those which fit his case. Because he reads in some blue-book of a strike for wages in Demerara, such as he may read of any day in Manchester, he draws a picture of Negro inactivity, copied from the wildest prophecies of the Slavery party before emancipation. If the Negroes worked no more than "half an hour a-day," would the sugar crops, in all except notoriously bad seasons, be so considerable, so little diminished from what they were in the time of Slavery, as is proved by the custom house returns? But it is not the facts of the question, so much as the moralities of it, that I care to dispute with your contributor.

A black man working no more than your contributor affirms that they work, is, he says, "an eye-sorrow," a "blister on the skin of the State," and many other things equally disagreeable; to work being the grand duty of man. "To do competent work, to labor honestly, according to the ability given them; for that, and for no other purpose, was each one of us sent into this world." Whoever prevents him from this, his "sacred appointment to labor while he lives on earth," is "his deadliest enemy." If it be "his own indolence" that prevents him, "the first right he has" is that all-wiser and more industrious persons shall, "by some wise means, compel him to do the work he is fit for." Why not at once say that, by "some wise means," everything should be made right in the world?—While we are about it, wisdom may as well be suggested as the remedy for all evils, as for one only. Your contributor incessantly prays Heaven that all persons, black and white, may be put in possession of the 'divine right of being compelled, if permitted will not serve, to do what work they are appointed for." But as this cannot be conveniently managed just yet, he will begin with the blacks, and make them work for certain whites, those whites not working at all; that so, "the eternal purpose and supreme will" may be fulfilled, and "injustice," which is "for ever accursed," may cease.

This pet theory of your contributor about work, we all know well enough, though some persons might not be prepared for so bold an application of it. Let me say a few words on this "gospel of work"—which, to my mind, as justly deserves the name of a cant as any of those which he has opposed; while the truth it contains is immeasurably farther from being the whole truth than that contained in the words benevolence, fraternity, or any other of his catalogue of contemptibilities. To give it a rational meaning, it must first be known what he means by work. Does work mean everything which people do? No; or he would not reproach people with doing no work. Does it mean laborious exertion? No: for many a day spent in killing game includes more muscular fatigue than a day's ploughing. Does it mean useful exertion? But your contributor always scoffs at the idea of utility. Does he mean that all persons ought to earn their living? But some earn their living by doing nothing, and some by doing mischief; and the negroes, whom he despises, still do earn by labor the "pumpkins" they consume and the finery they wear.

Work, I imagine, is not a good in itself. There is nothing laudable in work for work's sake. To work voluntarily for a worthy object is laudable; but what constitutes a worthy object? On this matter, the oracle of which your contributor is the prophet, has never yet been prevailed on to declare itself. He revolves in an eternal circle round the idea of work, as if turning up the earth, or driving a shuttle or a quill, were ends in themselves, and the ends of human existence. Yet, even in the case of the most sublime service to humanity, it is not because it is work that it is worthy: the worth lies in the service itself, and in the will to render it—the noble feelings of which it is the fruit; and if the nobleness of will is proved by other evidence than work, as for instance by danger or sacrifice, there is the same worthiness. While we talk only of work, and not of its object, we are far from the root of the matter; or if it may be called the root, it is a root without flower or fruit.

In the present case, it seems, a noble object means "spices." "The gods wish, besides pumpkins, that spices and valuable productions be grown in their West Indies"—the "noble elements of cinnamon, sugar, coffee, pepper, black and grey," "things far nobler than pumpkins." Why so? Is what supports life inferior in dignity to what merely gratifies the sense of taste? Is it the verdict of the "immortal gods" that pepper is noble, freedom (even freedom from the lash) contemptible? But spices lead "towards commerces, arts, politics, and social developments." Perhaps so; but of what sort? When they must be produced by slaves, the "politics and social developments" they lead to are such as the world, I hope, will not choose to be cursed with much longer.

The worth of work does not surely consist in its leading to other work, and so on to work without end. On the contrary, the multiplication of work, for purposes not worth caring about, is one of the evils of our present condition. When justice and reason shall be the rule of human affairs, one of the first things to which we may expect them to be applied is the question, How many of the so-called luxuries, conveniences, refinements, and ornaments of life are worth the labor which must be undergone as the condition of producing them? The beautifying of existence is as worthy and useful an object as sustaining it; but only a vitiated taste can see any such result in those fopperies of so-called civivilization which myriads of hands are now occupied and lives wasted in providing. In opposition to the "gospel of work," I would assert the gospel of leisure, and maintain that human beings cannot rise to the finer attributes of their nature compatibly with a life filled with labor. I do not include under the name labor such work, if work it be called, as is done by writers and afforders of "guidance," an occupation which, let alone the vanity of the thing, cannot be called by the same name with the real labor, the exhausting, stiffening, stupefying toil of many kinds of agriculture and manufacturing laborers. To reduce very greatly the quantity of work required to carry on existence is as needful as to distribute it more equally; and the progress of science, and the increasing ascendency of justice and good sense, tend to this result.

There is a portion of work rendered necessary by the fact of each person's existence: no one could exist unless work, to a certain amount, were done either by or for him. Of this each person is bound, in justice, to perform his share: and society has an incontestible right to declare to every one. that if he work not, at this work of necessity, neither shall he eat. Society has not enforced this right, having in so far postponed the rule of justice to other considerations. But there is an overgrowing demand that it be enforced, so soon as any endurable plan can be devised for the purpose. If this experiment is to be tried in the West Indies, let it be tried impartially; and let the whole produce belong to those who do the work which produces it. We would not have black laborers compelled to grow "spices which they do not want, and white proprietors who do not work at all, exchanging the spices for houses in Belgrave-square. We would not withhold from the whites, any more than from the blacks, the "divine right" of being compelled to labor. Let them have exactly the same share in the produce that they have in the work. If they do not like this, let them remain as they are, so long as they are permitted, and make the best of supply and demand.

Your contributor's notions ot justice and proprietary right are of another kind than these. According to him, the whole West Indies belong to the whites; the negroes have no claim there to either land or food, but by their sufferance. "It was not Black Quashee, or those he represents, that made those West India Islands what they are." I submit that those who furnished the thews and sinews really had something to do with the matter, "Under the soil of Jamaica the bones of many thousand British men"—"brave Colonel Fortescue, brave Colonel Brayne," and divers others, "had to be laid." How many hundred thousand African men laid their bones there, after having had their lives pressed out by slow or fierce torture? They could have better done without Colonel Fortescue, than Colonel Fortescue could have done without them. But he was the stronger, and could "compel;" what they did and suffered therefore goes for nothing. Not only they did not, but it seems they could not, have cultivated those islands. "Never by art of his (the negro) could one pumpkin have grown there to solace any human throat." They grow pumpkins, however, and more than pumpkins, in a very similar country, their native Africa. We are told to look at Haiti: what does your contributor know of Haiti? "Little or no sugar growing, black Peter exterminating black Paul and where a garden of the Hesperides might be, nothing but a tropical dog-kennel and pestiferous jungle." Are we to listen to arguments grounded on hearsays like these? In what is black Haiti worse than white Mexico? If the truth were known, how much worse is it than white Spain?

But the great ethical doctrine of the discourse, than which a doctrine more damnable, I should think, never was propounded by a professed moral reformer, is, that one kind of human beings are born servants to another kind. "You will have to be servants," he tells the Negroes, "to those that are born wiser than you, that are born lords of you—servants to the whites, if they are (as what mortal can doubt that they are?) born wiser than you?" I do not hold him to the absurd letter of his dictum; it belongs to the mannerism in which he is enthralled like a child in swaddling clothes. By "born wiser," I shall suppose him to mean, born more capable of wisdom; a proposition which he says, no mortal can doubt, but which I will make bold to say, that a full moiety of all thinking persons who have attended to the subject, either doubt or positively deny. Among the things for which your contributor professes entire disrespect is the analytical examination of human nature. It is by analytical examination that we have learned whatever we know of the laws of external nature; and if he had not disdained to apply the same mode of investigation to the laws of the formation of character, he would have escaped the vulgar error of imputing every difference which he finds among human beings as to an original difference of nature. As well might it be said that, of two trees, sprung from the same stock, one cannot be taller than another from greater vigor in the original seeding. Is nothing to be attributed to soil, nothing to climate, nothing to difference of exposure—has no lightning scathed it, no beast browsed on it, no insects preyed on it, no passing stranger stript off its leaves or its bark! If the trees grew near together, may not the one which, by whatever accident, grew up first, have regarded the other's development by its shade? Human beings are subject to an infinitely greater variety of accidents and external influences than trees, and have infinitely more operation in impairing the growth of one another; since those who begin by being strongest have almost always hitherto used their strength to keep the others weak. What the original differences are among human beings, I know no more than your contributor, and no less; it is one of the questions not yet satisfactorily answered in the natural history of the species. This, however, is well known—that spontaneous improvement beyond a very low grade—improvement by internal development, without aid from other individuals or peoples—is one of the rarest phenomena in history; and whenever known to have occurred, was the result of an extraordinary combination of advantages: in addition doubtless to many accidents of which all trace is now lost. No argument against the capacity of Negroes for improvement could be drawn from their not being one of these rare exceptions. It is curious withal, that the earliest known civilization was, we have the strongest reason to believe, a Negro civilization. The original Egyptians are inferred, from the evidence of their sculptures, to have been a Negro race: it was from Negroes, therefore, that the Greeks learnt their first lessons in civilization, and to the records and traditions of these Negroes did the Greek philosophers to the very end of their career resort (I do not say with much fruit) as a treasury of mysterious wisdom. But I again renounce all advantage from facts: were the whites born ever so superior in intelligence to the blacks, and competent by nature to instruct and advise them, it would not be the less monstrous to assert that they had therefore a right either to subdue them by force, or circumvent them by superior skill: to throw upon them the toils and hardships of life, reserving for themselves. under the misapplied name of work, its agreeable excitements.

Were I to point out, even in the highest terms, every vulnerable point in your contributor's discourse, I should produce a longer dissertation than his. One instance more must suffice. If labor is wanted, it is a very obvious idea to import laborers; and if negroes are best suited to the climate, to import negroes. This is a mode of adjusting the balance between work and laborers, quite in accordance with received principles: it is neither before nor behind the existing moralities of the world; and since it would accomplish the object of making the negroes work more, your contributor, at least, it might have been supposed, would have approved of it. On the contrary, this prospect is to him the most dismal of all; for either 'the new Africans, after laboring a little," will "take to pumpkins like the others," or if so many of them come that they will be obliged to work for their living, there will be "a black Ireland." The labor market admits of three possible conditions, and not, as this would imply, of only two. Either, first, the laborers can live almost without working, which is said to be the case in Demerara; or, secondly, which is the common case, they can live by working, but must work in order to live; or, thirdly, they cannot by working get a sufficient living, which is the case in Ireland. Your contributor sees only the extreme cases, but no possibility of the medium. If Africans are imported, he thinks there must either be so few of them, that they will not need to work, or so many, that although they work, they will not be able to live.

Let me say a few words on the general quarrel of your contributor with the present age. Every age has its faults, and is indebted to those who point them out. Our own age needs this service as much as others; but it must not be concluded that it has degenerated from former ages, because its faults are different. We must beware, too, of mistaking its virtues for faults, merely because, as is inevitable, its faults mingle with its virtues and color them. Your contributor thinks that the age has too much humanity, is too anxious to abolish pain. I affirm, on the contrary, that it has too little humanity—is most culpably indifferent to the subject; and I point to any day's police reports as the proof. I am not now accusing the brutal portion of the population, but the humane portion; if they were humane enough, they would have contrived long ago to prevent those daily atrocities. It is not by excess of a good quality that the age is in fault, but by deficiency—difficiency of philanthropy, and still more of other qualities wherewith to balance and direct what philanthropy it has. An "Universal Abolition of Pain Association" may serve to point a sarcasm, but can any worthier object of endeavor be pointed out than that of diminishing pain? Is the labor which ends in growing spices, noble, and not that which lessens the mass of suffering? We are told, with a triumphant air, as if it were a thing to be glad, that "the Destinies" proceed in a "terrible manner;" and this manner will not cease "for soft sawder or philanthropic stump-oratory;" but whatever the means may be, it has ceased in no inconsiderable degree. and is ceasing more and more; every year the "terrible manner," in some department or other, is made a little less terrible. Is our cholera comparable to the old pestilence—our hospitals to the old lazar-houses—our work-houses to the hanging of vagrants—our prisons to those visited by Howard? It is precisely because we have succeeded in abolishing so much pain, because pain and its infliction are no longer familiar as our daily bread, that we are so much more shocked by what remains of it than our ancestors were, or than in your contributor's opinion we ought to be.

But (however it be with pain in general) the abolition of the infliction of pain by the mere will of a human being, the abolition, in short of despotism, seems to be, in a peculiar degree, the occupation of this age; and it would be difficult to show that any age had undertaken a worthier. Though we cannot extirpate all pain, we can, if we are sufficiently determined upon it, abolish all tyranny; one of the greatest victories yet gained over that enemy is slave emancipation, and all Europe is struggling, with various success, towards further conquests over it. If, in the pursuit of this, we lose sight of any object equally important; if we forget that freedom is not the only thing necessary for human beings, let us be thankful to any one who points out what is wanting; but let us not consent to turn back.

That this country should turn back, in the matter of negro Slavery, I have not the smallest apprehension. There is, however, another place where that tyranny still flourishes, but now for the first time finds itself seriously in danger. At this crisis of American Slavery, when the decisive conflict between right and iniquity seems about to commence, your contributor steps in, and flings this missile, loaded with the weight of his reputation, into the Abolitionist camp. The words of English writers of celebrity are words of power on the other side of the ocean; and the owners of human flesh, who probably thought they had not an honest man on their side between the Atlantic and the Vistula will welcome such an auxiliary. Circulated as his dissertation will probably be, by those whose interests profit by it, from one end of the American Union to the other, I hardly know of an act by which one person could have done so much mischief as this may possibly do; and I hold that by thus acting, he has made himself an instrument of what an able writer in the *Inquirer* justly calls "a true work of the devil."

THE AMERICAN CONGRESS AND THE SLAVERY QUESTION IN ENGLAND.

The question of Slavery in the United States is every year becoming more and more ominous of the dark and doubtful issue that awaits the inevitable struggle between the Central Government and the Southern States. Three times in the history of the Union has the peace of this great confederation already suffered from the shock or hostile interests and passions arrayed against each other on questions of domestic policy, associated with this foul stain on the institutions of the republic. And now, another contest, more determined and seemingly less open to amicable compromise than all former ones, appears to threaten again, if not the safety, at least the tranquility of the Union.

One of the first questions that will, in all probability, be brought for discussion before the new Congress, involves elements of the fiercest discord between the Northern and Southern States. The introduction of a new free State into the Union would destroy the present political balance between the Pro and Anti Slavery parties in the Senate. In the House of Representatives there is an actual Democratic majority in favor of an utter exclusion of Slavery from all new States that may hereafter claim admission into the general confederation. In the Senate—no matter what may be their relative extent of population—all the States are equally represented, and have, consequently, the same power to annul or control the measures of the lower House.—Whilst the House of Representatives, therefore, expresses the general sense of the whole American people, on all questions affecting the aggregate interests or policy of the Union, the Senate is the especial protector and conservator of the separate rights and interests of the individual States. Hitherto, the slaveholding States have had their stronghold in the Senate, and though vastly inferior in wealth and population to the free States of the North and West, have always been powerful enough to control the policy of the more popular branch of the Legislature on the subject of Slavery. This question has now, however, assumed a much more formidable aspect than on any former occasion; for the Free Soil party, strengthened by political amalgamation with the Democrats of the North and West, has in the recent elections acquired a supremacy decisive enough to render it omnipotent in the lower House of Congress. They have accordingly determined rigidly to enforce the Wilmot Proviso, and admit no more States into the Union except upon conditions that render the absolute prohibition of Slavery imperative in the written constitution of every new State.

Against this policy the Southern States have announced their determination to make an effectual stand. They have raised the old cry of nullification, and threatened a dismemberment of the Union, should any measure compromising the rights of any future States to frame whatever domestic institutions they choose, be definitely sanctioned by Congress. The whole question will necessarily be raised by the petition already forwarded by the provisional government of California, for the formal admission of that State into the Union.

From the tone and temper of the American press, it is quite obvious that both parties are thoroughly bent upon a rigid and uncompromising enforcement of their respective views. There can be no doubt that the admission of California as a free State would give to the Free Soil party a majority in both houses that would enable them to legalize the condition of the Wilmot proviso. At present this proviso has only the force of precedent, not of law. When Oregon was admitted, two sessions ago, into the Union, this proviso, absolutely prohibitive of Slavery, was inserted by Congress in the law which organized that territory into a confederated State. Mr. Calhoun and the Southern delegates protested most vehemently against the introduction of such a clause, as a gross violation of State rights. The prohibition of Slavery in California will be opposed by the Southern Senators, not only as an infraction of State rights, but as involving also a breach of the Missouri compromise. The acquisition of Texas, however, and the conquest of New Mexico, has vastly added to the territories of the United States, and it may fairly be contended that the provisions of the Missouri compromise are applicable only to such States as were comprised within the Union at the time that compromise was effected. Now, that compromise, prohibiting Slavery in all the future States of the Union that might be formed out of the territory north ot a certain latitude 36 deg. 30 min., was made on the admission of Missouri into Union, in 1821. The obvious intention of that compromise, on the part of Congress, was to limit the extension of Slavery, without any direct interference with the rights or independence of any existing States in which Slavery was then established. Texas, New Mexico, and one-half of the whole territory of California, lie unquestionably south of the line of the Missouri compromise; but on what possible grounds can it be alledged that they are in any way implicated in the provisions of that arrangement? The whole of that vast territory has been ceded to the American Union, nearly thirty years subsequent to the Missouri compromise, and is the property of the confederated States, subject to whatever conditions the central government and legislature may see fit to insist upon in any future extension of the rights and privileges of incorporation. The determination of the Southern slaveholding States to enforce the application of the Missouri compromise to all the newly acquired territory south of the boundary line, is a most audacious and unwarrantable defiance of the proper rights and sovereignty of the whole confederation.

Whatever may be the issue of the struggle about to be precipitated, it is in every way desirable that it should neither be postponed nor compromised.—Sooner or later this question of Slavery will force itself upon the American people with fearful emphasis. The dangers and difficulties that surround it now, can only be augmented by weak or temporizing concessions, calculated to favor or uphold the extension of Slavery. The firm determination of Congress to limit Slavery, within its existing boundaries, would be the most merciful as well as the wisest step that could be taken in the interest of the slave owners themselves. However reckless or desperate may be the efforts of the Southern States to prolong the reign of Slavery, it is a doomed institution. It cannot subsist, as a vast anomaly, in the heart of a civilized and democratic community. It must ultimately cease, either by voluntary emancipation or violent insurrection. Denounced by Christianity as unjust, repudiated by political economy as unprofitable, confined to a few States of a vast continent with a free population, extending and multiplying on every side, it cannot stand, as an isolated iniquity, in the midst of such a prolific and adventurous civilization. The admission of California as a free State, and the legal prohibition of Slavery in all future States of the Union, would inevitably compel the Southern slaveowners to meet the question of emancipation by timely and well matured preparatives. As to the nullification or dismemberment of the Union, though the Hotspurs of the South may threaten, they are too conscious of weakness to venture rashly upon such ruin. Without the Northern States the Southern would be powerless. They could neither raise a revenue from slaves nor find sailors nor soldiers for defence or commerce. Slavery has been their curse—it has paralyzed their industry—extinguished all enterprize—limited the growth and enfeebled the energies of their white population. The commercial resources of the North are essential to whatever prosperity can be shared by the South. As an independent confederation, they would be without everything that constitutes national strength. Exporting the whole of their produce, what could they do without a commercial navy, or how would they provide a safe defence for their seaboard, without the maritime resources of the North?—The threat of dismemberment is an idle vaunt, which neither their means nor their interests would let them put in force. To arrest the extension of Slavery is a policy as just and humane on the part of Congress towards the slaves as to the free States. The whole civilized world is interested in the movement that seems to be approaching the commencement, at least, of an inevitable solution of this dark problem of American Slavery. To deprive the slave States of every hope of extending their political power to maintain Slavery, is the necessary prelude to any serious or earnest device for its ultimate abolition. The enforcement of the terms of the Wilmot proviso in the future constitution of every new State, would, at any rate, exonerate the great Republic from the odious infamy of countenancing an institution so abhorrent to the humanity and civilization of the age. We shall look with intense interest to the proceedings of Congress on this question; and, judging from the strength of the Free Soil party in the House of Representatives, and the resolution to carry out the policy manifested by the organs of the Democrats throughout the North and West, we are sanguine enough to hope that the statesmen of America, will so moderate and guide the conflict, that neither the peace of the Union nor the interests of humanity may be compromised by. the result.—*Manchester Times.*

The Southern Press: Father Mathew.

FATHER MATHEW AND THE UNITED STATES SENATE.

On the 19th instant, (we quote from the Washingotn Union.) the following resolution was submitted to the Senate of the United States;

Resolved, That the Rev. Theobald Mathew be permitted to sit within the bar of the Senate, during the period of his sojourn in Washington.

This resolution produced a debate, in which a number of the most distinguished members of that august body participated, in support of, or in opposition to, the resolution. Some Senators opposed the resolution on the ground of precedent, but the chief objection urged against the extension of the privilege, was some opinion said to be entertained by the distinguished benefactor of humanity, inimical to the institution of Slavery, or his having signed, at some remote era, in the heyday of O'Connellism, an address, to his countrymen, in the United States, on the iniquities of slaveholding.

As we had occasion. some couple of weeks since, to inform the public that our city was promised an early visit from the reverend apostle of temperance, we deemed it our duty then, to dissent from the pro-slavery supersentiveness that can discover nothing valuable, nothing praiseworthy, nothing worthy of our homage and respect, unless connected with an institution, which few can be brought, even among its most interested supporters, to regard otherwise than a huge social evil. So far as the moral and physical well-being of the African is concerned, we regard Slavery, as it exists in these States, an unalloyed blessing; and all interference with it, under whatever pretext, by friend or foe, contemplating manumission and continued residence of the manumitted among us, an evil of the greatest magnitude. These sentiments we believe to be very generally entertained by all persons having a practical acquaintance with the subject, whether, they are slaveholders, like ourselves, or mere sojourners among us, attracted thither by hopes of profit, in pursuit of pleasure, or desire for information.

We have never met an intelligent man, no matter where born, or whence he hails, his previous convictions or nurtured prejudices, but frankly and freely admitted that domestic Slavery in the United States existed but in name, and that it would be unfair to the slaveholder, repugnant to justice, and in opposition to truth, to maintain, that in any nation of christian Europe, the bulk of the population is in any respect comparable to our slaves in all that conduces to the physical and moral wants of men. What, then, have we to fear from the visits of good, intelligent and virtuous christian ministers, like Mathew; what from a personal and minute examination of the practical workings of an institution, in the establishment of which the present race of men had no agency, by able, impartial and honorable statesmen, like Lord Morpeth, whom we all remember during his welcome sojourn in Louisiana? We have nothing to conceal from the prying eyes of public curiosity, and we are well content to submit the examination of Slavery among us, to every candid and intelligent individual; satisfied that, though we may not succeed in extracting an approval of its existence in the abstract, he will be very strongly impressed with the fact, that it is not what factious knaves or designing fanatics calumniously represent it, for objects of disgusting baseness or misdirected zeal.

It is apart from our present purpose, either to defend Father Mathew from the charge of Abolitionism. or to insinuate a belief that his visit to the South will convert him into a pro-slavery man. If the reverend reformer interfered with the subject, during his stay in these States, or if he lent himself on this, or any other subject, peculiarly or properly out of his sphere, to subserve the designs of demagogues, we should be found denouncing his visit, instead of joining in a welcome to one, whom we are proud to consider as more worthy of our commendation, than chieftain however successful, or statesman however profound. We honor him, because his mission is not to disturb men's minds, but to elevate the fallen, to raise the debased. and to extirpate a vice more fatal to mankind, than perhaps all others combined; and because, to use the language of Senator Hale, "the hopes of Abolitionists in Father Mathew's coming to this country, have most signally failed, and have been entirely disappointed."

Our readers will bear in mind the gratifying fact, that Senators Downs and Soule both voted to extend the honors of the Senate chamber to the distinguished champion of sobriety. General Downs delivered the following eloquent, wise, liberal and most appropriate observations, in the debate of the Senate; and, as they include fully our own views and express our own feelings on the matter, we have great pleasure in translating them to our columns, from the *Union's* report.

"If I thought for a moment, that there was any thing in the past history of the individual to whom this resolution applies, or that there was likely to be anything in his opinions advocated, or in his conduct in his proposed visit to the South, inimical to our interests, or hostile to our opinions, then I would certainly be one of the first to oppose him. But is this the case? I think not. It is said that, long ago, before he came to America, he expressed opinions opposed to Slavery. Well, suppose he did; is it reasonable or proper in us of the South to require of him to retract those opinions? He comes among us, not as a propagandist either of religious or political doctrines, but on a benevolent mission of humanity, to make mankind better and happier, like the Saviour of the world, who preceded him—on a mission scarcely less divine. He has, when approached, refused to commit himself, or in any manner to interfere in public affairs or opinions on that subject in our country. Is not this a course which all must approve of? Could he with propriety, or without defeating the success of his mission, have pursued a different course? For myself, I confess, coming to the United States for the benevolent purpose he did—an object to be accomplished in no particular sections, and by no particular party or sect, but throughout our broad land, from north to south, and from east to west, and by the coöperation of the well-disposed of all—if he had taken any part in political discussions, or obtruded his opinions on all occasions, I should not have approved of his course, even if it had been in favor of our side of the question, but should have considered him wanting in that wisdom and discretion, necessary for the success of his mission. Desires, sir, we of the South believe ourselves to be right in our opinions on the subject of Slavery; that our course will bear the test of scrutiny and examination; that people abroad entertain erroneous opinions of our institutions, which would be removed by visiting our country and ascertaining the true state of the case. Would it not, then, be expedient and unwise to ask Father Mathew, before he has visited one section of the country, and had an opportunity of judging for himself, to change opinions previously formed? Would the world say this was the conduct of a people confident of the justice of their cause; or would not it rather say, there is something to conceal, or there would not be such precaution? For myself, I do not believe that he has evinced any disposition to interfere in our institutions. On the country, it seems to be admitted on all sides that, when approached by the Abolitionists on the subject, he refused to concur with them in their views, or give them any encouragement. But even if he was so disposed, I have too much confidence in the justice of our cause and the strength of our institutions to suppose he could do us any harm.

Mr. President, I shall vote for the resolution on another ground. The distinguished gentleman is upon a mission which I consider of vast importance to the people of the United States, and to all the world. I believe his efforts are to be of immense advantage, and I concur in the object of them, and I wish them success, and am disposed to advance them in every possible way. I presume there is not an individual in this Senate, but will use his utmost endeavors to promote that object.

Mr. President, I cannot see the occasion for offering this resolution; but, since it has been offered, let it be considered and passed. I beg my Southern friends to reflect upon the rejection of this resolution, before the venerable gentleman makes his departure to our section of the country. He is engaged in a benevolent mission, and perhaps, if he is so unapprovingly received by the Senate of the United States, it will lessen the good effects of his mission, and paralyze his efforts, and take away the great advantages that will accrue to the United States through his exertions, and to our sections as well as others.

I ask my Southern friends if the movement will not be impolitic? To give their disapprobation of the gentleman's conduct would be as much as to say that he ought not to go among us. I am sure none of them opposed the resolution on this ground, but still this may, and I fear will, be the effect of its rejection. I do not wish, when he is about to cross our borders, to push him back with an inhospitable and unkind hand. I wish to cheer him on in his good work. I do not intend to do anything that will seem like repelling him from my State. I want him to go there. I think I can say for the people of my State, that he will be received with open arms and the kindest greetings; and I will not do anything here offensive to such a feeling.—*New Orleans True Delta.*

THE FATHER MATHEW DEBATE.

Among those who took part in the debate on the resolution to admit Father Mathew to a seat on the floor of the Senate were Messrs. Downs of Louisiana, Houston of Texas and Foote of Mississippi.

The speech of Mr. Downs we publish in full; and we admit that we are proud of the position assumed and the tone used by our Senator during the debate of the 20th. With truth and with force the honorable gentleman represents that Louisiana will never be among the querulous tribe who snuff an insult or an injury in every breeze; but when the time requires, and the occasion demands, Louisiana will be found the unflinching assertor of her just rights and indisputable interests.

Mr. Houston, too, is found on the side for the admission of Father Mathew; and while he declares hostility to the disorganizing influences of abolitionism, he fails not to repudiate the equally dangerous and destructive doctrines of nullification. The vote of Gen. Houston in favor of the great Temperance Apostle was given with peculiar grace, as it is well known how much the Senator from Texas has been benefitted by the pledge that the Irish Father administers. In fact, Mr. Houston in his speech of the 20th acknowledges how much he owes to the cause of Temperance.

But the great speech of the day was that of the inimitable and indescribable Mr. Foote of Missisippi. His remarks defy analysis and sneer at criticism; but his remarks are hardly as defiant of good sense and reason as is his vote on the resolution. After giving reasons—or what he calls reasons—why he would vote for the admission of Father Mathew, Mr. Foote finds out, at the eleventh hour, that he must answer "nay" to the call of the Clerk. If we had room for the whole speech, we would like to give it, as a fine example of the felicity of indiscretion so remarkable in the Senator. The improper and the unbecoming are rarely brought to such a climax as in this last masterly absurdity of Mr. Henry S. Foote. Had Mr. Foote been content to give silly reasons for any course he was about to pursue, the incident would have been so common-place as hardly to merit special notice. The Tom Thumb of the Senate has full license to commit ordinary puerilities and extravagancies. But when the tiny man treats us to an extraordinary exhibition, we hope we will not be considered as trite in our remarks on the particular performances of the Lilliputian here. It was a sight for gods and men, to behold the severe blistering of Mr. Seward—the New York Senator—by the Spanish fly Senator from Mississippi. How Seward must have winced when Foote told him that he was only fishing for the Irish votes of 1852! How he must have trembled when the little Mississippi Senator opened on him with so much power of invective and strength of denunciation! The gentlemen from New York was so much terrified by the onslaught of the irascible, though infantine Mississippian, that he could not open his mouth in reply. He was literally silent from fright.

For the sake of Southern rights and Southern interests, it is time for us to remove the idea that such men as Mr. Foote are our peculiar representatives and advocates. When little statutes try to place themselves on the top of the column of great interests, it is time to shiver the diminutive but aspiring images. A man may be a fit idol for himself, and not suit the worshipping fancies of other people. Mr. Foote may think he would be visible if placed on the top of the Capital at Washington; but he would really appear very small when put on the gate-post of the Capitol grounds. He may think himself a proper man to be entrusted with Southern rights and interests: but, from all appearances, we doubt whether he would make more than a respectable member of the Senate Committee on the Library.—*N. O. Crescent.*

U. S. SENATE: FATHER MATHEW.

Quite a spirited debate sprang up in the United States Senate on the 20th ult., consequent upon the introduction of a resolution to admit "Father Mathew" within the bar of that body, during his stay in Washington.

The resolution was opposed by some of the southern Senators, on account of the Cold Water Apostle's sentiments, as expressed some years ago, on the subject of Slavery. This, however, was by other Senators satisfactorily explained. Whatever his

opinions may have been in Ireland a number of years since in relation to southern institutions, his conduct in reference to that subject since his arrival in this country, has, in our opinion, and so far as we have seen, been quite judicious and unexceptionable. Father Mathew came to this country by express invitation, for the sole purpose of promoting the great cause of Temperance: that was his special mission, and in the furtherance of it he refused to turn aside (a hard thing for a Catholic Priest) even for the purpose of promoting the fortunes of his church Although this was well known, yet that vulgar-minded brawling demagogue, Garrison, had the impudence to obtrude himself upon Mr. Mathew, and, in a very low-bred, and almost ruffian manner, endeavoring to draw him out on the subject of Slavery. To have complied, whatever his sentiments may have been, would have utterly defeated the great object of his visit to this country. He, therefore, very properly and in a manner which showed great liberality of feeling towards the institution of Slavery, refused to be made the tool of any such insidious scheme, and sent the mischief making miscreant about his business For which wise and prudent act, he has ever since been handsomely complimented by this arch Abolitionist's very choicest abuse.

The truth is, there are many persons at the South, who are entirely too sensitive, as regards the private opinions of individuals from distant States and countries on the subject of Slavery. It looks, it seems to us, as if we were conscious that our "peculiar institution" would not bear a close examination, and that we were somewhat dubious about our ability to justify and maintain it, unless favored by the good opinion of the the world. It appears to us that it would be in much better taste and much more dignified, to say nothing of the reasonableness of the thing, to observe a manner of the most stoical, or rather of the most contemptuous indifference, as to what any body or all the world together might think of our domestic institutions, so long as they had the discretion to refrain from intermeddling with it This was the view taken of the matter by Senator Mangum. Besides it is perfect Quixotism to suppose that the whole world can be brought to think upon the matter as we do

The debate was protracted, it being participated in by some eighteen or twenty speakers, including Clay, Calhoun, Cass, Butler, Berrien, Douglas Houston, Foote, Davis Clemens, Seward, Hale, &c It was altogether highly interesting, as well as in some portions decidedly amusing. The resolution was supported among others by Clay and Cass, not that they were in favor of introducing such a resolution but as it was before the Senate, and being a very small and harmless matter, out of regard for the feelings of Mr. Mathew, they were unwilling to vote against it. Calhoun opposed it as being unprecedented. Foote first favored it; but after learning from Mr. Calhoun that it was altogether unusual, he changed his position. General Houston was in favor of the resolution; and in allusion to some preceding arguments closed a short speech, by saying that, "as he was not a garrulous old man, nor a testy old woman, he would not threaten the Union" The resolution finally passed by a vote of 33 to 18.

Our new Senator, Mr. Clemens, took the lead in declaring war upon the movement, embracing the occasion to make his first speech in the Senate. Mr. Foote complimented him by saying that it was the most brilliant parliamentary *debut* that he had ever witnessed. But with whatever indifference the opinions of private individuals on the subject of Slavery may be regarded, it is a different matter with reference to the sentiments of United States' Senators when publicly avowed as those upon which they are willing and ready to act It was, therefore, with infinite satisfaction that we read, in the course of this debate, the remarks of Messrs. Clemens and Foote in which they bestowed upon Seward and the fanatics generally so unmerciful, but so well deserved a scourging A portion of the speech of Colonel Clemens may be found in another column of to-day's paper.—*The (Montgomery Ala) Atlas.*

The Anti-Slavery Standard.

Without Concealment---Without Compromise.

NEW YORK: THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1850.

The Annexation of Canada.

THE hopes of the disaffected Canadians of being incorporated with the Model Republic seem to be indefinitely postponed. The strange expectation which appeared to prevail among them, as well as on this side the line, that the Mother Country would give this overgrown child the rest of her time, and suffer her to sit up on her own account, or consent to her marriage with Brother Jonathan, has been put at rest by the letter of Lord Grey to Lord Elgin. One would think that John Bull had given the world a sufficient taste of his quality to prevent any one from indulging in so wild a dream as that he would give up the remotest corner of his dependencies as long as he could hold on to them. It is not a question which a great Nation ever seriously entertains, that of dismembering itself, any more than a man cuts off his fingers or toes from a theory that they are remote and insignificant. It is not a matter of pounds, shillings and pence, but of National pride and dignity. It is this feeling, in a great measure, that makes the North cling to our Union. We can show that the Union of the Free States to the Slave States costs the first more than the Canadas, not to say all her Colonies, do Great Britain; but a comparatively few can be found, none indeed, who even take this circumstance into the account, when they contemplate the reduction of a great Empire into two lesser ones. It is only an abstract principle, of love of Liberty on the one hand, and of love of Slavery on the other, that overcomes the sentiment of National pride and makes that passion subordinate to its triumph.

We cannot but acknowledge to having entertained some wandering visions, and built a few castles in the air for their reception, upon this unsubstantial foundation,—though we never for a moment believed that it had any real ground to rest upon. But we had applied the *Media Scientia*, not to the consideration of the possible results had the events of history fallen out otherwise than they have, but to the probable posture of affairs should things that have not come to pass happen as it was supposed they might. It would have made a new ground for a very pretty quarrel with the South, when a territory equal to the whole of the United States, where Slavery could not possibly exist, came to the Northern gate and knocked for admission. We should then have heard very different doctrines as to the Extension of the Area of Freedom. The dangers of an over-extended dominion and the inconveniences of a mixture of races would have made themselves sensibly felt when the one stretched over Northern plains and the other consisted of Canadian *habitans* instead of Louisiana creoles or New Mexican half-breeds. A new and interesting cast, too, would have been to be seen sicklying over the half-baked features of Northern Doughfaceism. We should by no means have been fatigued with that painful uniformity of sentiment which marked the South on the subject of Slave-territory. There would have been an Anti-Annexation party at the North which we are very certain would have been sufficient to enable the South to prevent it. While we must lament, therefore, the loss of these entertaining and instructive spectacles, it is perhaps fortunate that the question is likely to be postponed for some little time, to let the pear get quite ripe.

We entirely stand by the British Government, however, in their course in this regard. Queen Victoria has shown herself to be a nursing mother to these forward children of hers. She seems bent upon bringing them up in the way they should go. Bad Company is always one of the staple elements of parental anxiety and exhortation, and has been ever since, and long before, the days of Solomon. And, surely, there could not be worse company, more evil communications, than those into which the Canadian branch of the British family seemed bent to rush. As a general rule we admit that children should be allowed to choose for themselves with whom they will cast in their lot for better, for worse, but there are cases of such extremity of bad character that a good parent could not excuse himself from forbidding the banns. To permit well-behaved British subjects to metamorphose themselves into American citizens, American citizenship being what it now is, as long as it could possibly be prevented, would be indeed a repudiation of all that is parental in the relations of Governments. Just conceive Canada changed from the sanctuary of the fugitive, from the American Haynaus, into a hunting ground or a cage for him!—Now, there is not a Canadian that would not spurn the idea of betraying him that wandereth; then, it would become his sworn duty at least not to hide the outcast. The Church of Canada is now pure from the wickedness of baptizing Slavery; it would, then, be turned, like ours, into Propaganda for teaching that the "Sum of all Villainies" is not inconsistent with the moral virtues and the Christian graces. It would be a demoralization from which it behoves the Head of the Church of England to protect its Members.

We can readily conceive that the situation of Canada, an adult colony under the tutelage of a Step-mother Country, may be sufficiently annoying in many respects. But we cannot think it bad enough to excuse the strong measure of throwing herself into the arms of so very discreditable a partner for life as her neighbour Jonathan. It would be too much like jumping out of the frying-pan into the fire. We think it is one of those extreme cases which would justify the guardian in putting her under lock and key. And this restraint would be made the more easily, inasmuch as the swain is too much engaged in *larrupping* his niggers, swapping notions, playing props in California and practising on his neighbours with revolvers and bowie knives, to care much about rescuing this Dulcinea from the durance of her cross-grained Duenna. If there were spirit enough in the Northern States to preach a Crusade of Annexation, as the South did in the case of Texas, and the rest of Mexico by instalment, there would be some justification and possible good in the creation of Free States out of the boundless extent of British America. But there is not, yet, and it is not clear that it can ever be got into them either by kicks or arguments. So it is best as it is, for the present. We are not worthy of being annexed to one of the dependencies of the British empire. The American Eagle is a craven fowl in the presence of the British Lion Much as we wish the retaliatory Annexation of Canada might be carried through, for the sake of the political advantage it would be to us, we cannot have the heart to desire it in view of the moral mischiefs which it must inevitably work to her.

We believe that the Annexation of Canada is a moral and political impossibility, under any possible circumstances which can occur during the present Union of these States. Are the Slaveholders going to stultify and nullify themselves by an act of political suicide? Whatever charges have been brought against them there is one to which they are not abnoxious. They are no fools, and will never consent to have their throat cut as long as they can keep the knife away from it. With a slaveholding or a pro-slavery President, which is an inevitable incident of our present institutions, and with the control they must necessarily exert over our National legislation, we believe it would be as possible to annex the Moon as Canada. If the North has not had the sense and spirit to arm even a rush against the Annexation of Mexico *ad libitum*, how can we expect to find either to carry through a measure which would call forth the most desperate resistance. If the "Anti-Slavery Whigs" have already virtually offered the Wilmot Proviso to be kicked out of Congress, how can it be expected that they should make a stand for the Admission of Canada, a measure the little finger of which is stronger than the loins of the Proviso. Still we believe that it is the Manifest Destiny of Canada to be one with the Free States, and to help make up the great Republic of Northern America. We believe it cannot be ultimately hindered, but it will be through or over the ruins of the present Union and Constitution. If Slavery could be abolished under those institutions, there would be no opposition to her admission. Should they break down, as one day they must, her amalgamation with the Northern segment would be inevitable. Let her bide her time and stand in the attitude not of supplication but of superiority, and refuse to cast in her lot with us as long as we are in league with thieves and oppressors. She is too good for us now. By the time we are fit company for her she will find our doors and our hearts wide open for her reception.—E. Q.

More Compromises.

ON Monday of last week, Hon. W. R. W. Cobb, of Alabama offered the following preamble and resolution in the House of Representatives, by way of Compromise of the Slavery Agitation:

Whereas, a crisis in the political affairs of this Republic has arrived, when men of all political parties are called to aid in the great work of reconciliation between the Northern and Southern people: Whereas, the question of Slavery in the Territories; the admission of California into the Union as a State, under her own Constitution and boundaries; the prohibition of the slave trade in the District of Columbia, and the abolition of Slavery therein, are, and have been, a bone of contention for years past, and will be for years to come, unless settled;

Whereas the mind of the whole community is now fixed with great anxiety upon the present Congress—looking to them to consider gravely and deliberately these vexed questions; and if possible to have them settled upon constitutional equitable principles between the North and the South: And whereas there are many men who have introduced plans such as they think calculated to produce that effect, but owing to the spirit that too often prevails, (if not in this case) of too many wishing the honor of bringing forward and consummating great and important questions, and thereby coming in conflict with each other, and thus effect nothing; Now,

Be it Resolved and recommended, (the Senate concurring,) That a committee be appointed by the Senate and House of Representatives, to consist of six members of the Senate—three from the North and three from the South; also twenty by the House. ten from the South and ten from the North, to devise, if possible, a plan predicated upon constitutional and equitable principles, for adjusting all difficulty growing out of the foregoing causes; and that such plan be submitted to the respective houses for their consideration.—thereby, if possible, to perpetuate the good feeling and union of the two parties forever: and that the Southern and Northern members in each House respectively select such persons to serve on said committee in any manner they think proper.

On the same day Mr. Gorman, of Indiana, sent to the Speaker's table the following resolutions, giving notice of his intention to offer some remarks upon them at the proper time.

With a view to harmonize and settle the conflicting sentiments of the people on the subject of Slavery, and to preserve the integrity of the union of the States:

Resolved, That the Committee on territories inquire into the expediency of admitting California into the Union with her present Constitution, reserving to Congress the right hereafter to form a State or States out of her present boundaries, which said new States shall be north of 36 deg 30 min. north latitude.

Also to embrace another provision for another State out of the present limits of Texas, in accordance with the resolution of annexation, which State shall be west of the Colorado with any further regulations as to boundary as may be necessary.

Also, to embrace a provision organizing Territorial Governments for New Mexico and Deseret:

Which Territorial Governments shall recognize the right of the people to govern themselves as they may think best calculated to secure their liberty, happiness and prosperity, untrammeled by any action of Congress "other than by the consent of the governed," under the restrictions and limitations of the Constitution of the United States.

Also, to embrace in the same general bill a proposition to purchase of the State of Texas all that part of her present boundary as lies north of 34 deg. north latitude, according to the map attached to the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo; which territory, when so purchased, shall be attached to the limits of New Mexico and governed according to the laws and institutions which be therin established.

Both of these propostions lie over under the rule of the House.

THE DIVINE INSTITUTION.—The *Louisville Courier* of the 25th of January sketches a feature of the divine Institution recently exhibited in that city:

AFFECTING INCIDENT.

Yesterday morning we witnessed a scene that we little believed could be enacted within the borders of Kentucky. The steamer G. W. Kendall was lying at the wharf at the foot of Wall street, preparing to start for New Orleans. On the forecastle deck stood a group consisting of a *master and five or six slaves, including a woman with a child at the breast*, who were apparently going to the South. Just as the last bell of the steamer rang out its peal for departure, and the lines were about to be cast loose, the mother was bade to give up her infant, and was told that she must go without it. At this intimation the poor creature became frantic with grief. She caressed the child a moment, then flew to her trunk in which had been packed various little articles of clothing that she had made up for it to wear. These she first pressed fervently to her lips and then bestowed them upon the child. Her owner then ordered her to follow him, and she mechanically started to obey, but the promptings of nature were too strong within her swelling breast to be resisted, and with loud sobs of grief she turned, embraced her child, and clung to it with the tenacity of despair.

The heart-rending grief of the woman, and her frantic gestures, attracted the attention of persons passing along the levee, and strongly excited the sympathies of many. The owner was asked by a gentleman if he would sell the woman and child. To this he assented, and demanded $650 for them. Upon inquiry, however, it was ascertained that the woman was to be sold down the river, and that the child would be disposed of here. The bystanders volunteered to raise subscriptions to buy the child, and send it with its mother, and several of them proffered $10 apice. At this juncture Captain Norton, the Captain of the boat, came forward and told the owner of the slaves that he would not take them on his boat, and sent the whole party ashore, and in a few minutes the steamer was seen dashing over the falls without them.

Relative value of Slave-Labor

The Valley Farmer, an agricultural paper, published at St. Louis, Mo., bears the following candid testimony as to the value of Slave-labor on farms, and coming from such a source, above all suspicion of incendiarism, it is entitled to so much the more weight. The view of the editor is as old as Adam Smith, but is nevertheless one which many honest northern people are yet far from accepting. He says:

—We have repeatedly been asked our opinions upon questions connected with the subject of Slavery—particularly as the interests of agriculture in our own State and latitude are concerned. We do not feel qualified to express very confidently our opinion as to the relative profit of slave or free labor upon a farm, to the individual employing the one or the other—it would doubtless vary with circumstances, but of the effect upon the whole agricultural community, there can, we think, be no doubt; the influence of Slavery is to retard its growth, depress the great mass of its members, and concentrate in the hands of a few the wealth of the whole. To the young or poor man, who has not capital to invest in this kind of property an incubus is laid which hinders him from putting forth those exertions which are necessary to enable him to elevate his condition. He finds himself in a community divided into two great classes, and he has little feeling in common with either. He cannot associate with the aristocracy of the masters, because *he works for a living*, and he is not allowed to associate with the servants, nor do his inclinations, habits or pursuits prompt him te do so. Finding himself cut off and isolated, he seeks a more congenial section, and we accordingly find that a large portion of the settlers of the new States in the north west have been just such men; and although the States they have left may have continued to increase in wealth, they have failed to retain that hardy, intelligent population, which is of far more value to any State than any amount of gold or silver or cultivated fields.

—We claim to be the particular friend of the farmer in moderate circumstances—the small farmer—the beginner—and of the man who feels the need of information to enable him to use the labor of his own hands to the best advantage; and though mindful of the interests of all engaged in agriculture, our highest pride is to be useful to this class; and we believe such men receive less benefit (if there is any benefit or advantage in the system) from the institution of Slavery than any other portion of the community.

Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Fair.

WE copy, as in duty bound, the following very satisfactory Report of the Pennsylvania Fair Committee from the *Freeman*:

REPORT

Of the Committee of the Fourteenth Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Fair.

This Fair was held in the large saloon of the Assembly Buildings, on the 18th, 19th, 20th, 21st and 22d of December.

The Receipts were	$1576 86
Expenses "	350 60
Balance	$1226 26

The Committee gratefully report the accomplishment of their work, the pecuniary results of which are stated above. The attending circumstances,—public interest, social intercourse, high-toned meetings for addresses and discussions—make the sum total of good beyond estimate or calculation.

As for years past, the labors of the friends in our vicinity cheered our hearts and added to the value of the Fair.

Bristol, Norristown, Byberry, Darby, Merion, Kennett and Marlborough furnished tables, with beautiful and valuable articles; liberal donations were received from our city friends whose aid has been given for many years, and also from a number whose "first fruits" give promise of future abundance.

Harrisburg, Milton, Isabella Furnace, Schuylkill, Radnor, Lawrenceville, Pottstown, Norristown, Germantown, Wakefield, Yardleyville, Mullica Hill and Salem, failed not in their welcome supplies.

We received with particular pleasure donations from absent members of our committee; beautiful needle work from one in New York; a box containing the work of a "Circle" created by the active interest of one removed to Connecticut; also elegant articles from Paris testifying that in illness and absence the claims of the slave are remembered and allowed.

From New York, Boston, Nantucket and Pawtucket, very valuable donations were received.

Early in last year, letters were written to the friends of the slave in Great Britain, in the hopes of receiving goods from them that would render our Fair particularly attractive. Contributions were received from many kind and energetic friends, testifying that the claims of the slave were felt and acknowledged.

An additional box sent from London was not received till the Fair was closed.

We owe an apology to our friends, who were disappointed by the late arrival of the articles from Paris by a liberal contributor to our Fair. So confidently were they expected, that we hesitated not to announce them, but unexpected and unusual circumstances delayed their reception.

On behalf of the Committee,

SARAH PUGH,
ANNA M. HOPPER,
JENNETTE JACKSON,
ANNA M. CHILD.

Philadelphia, January 9th, 1850.

MR. GODEY AND GRACE GREENWOOD.—Mr. Godey, the proprietor of the magazine known by his name, who recently sold himself to the South at the regular subscription price, and erased Grace Greenwood's name as editor from the cover of his periodical, has replaced her name on the February No. Miss Greenwood, (Clark), however, does not accede to this attempt of Mr. Godey to use her as a patch for his damaged reputation. She publishes the following card in the *Pittsburg Dispatch*:

A Card.—As Mr. L. A. Godey, in the February number of his magazine, has again published my name as that of an Editor—restored it to the cover from which he removed it in January—I beg leave to state to my Western friends that this restoration was made without my concurrence or knowledge. I have no connection either editorially or otherwise with the *Lady's Book*.

GRACE GREENWOOD.

New Brighton, Jan. 22, 1850.

FATHER MATHEW.—Judge Lumpkin's opinion of the Irish representative of the Apostle who "went out and hanged himself" does not seem to be shared by his Temperance brethren of Georgia. The several Temperance Societies of Savannah recieved Father Mathew on his arrival in that city, and escorted him in form to the residence provided for him. His presentation of the pledge is not interfered with by any supposed heresy on the subject of Slavery.

JAY'S MEXICAN WAR.—We learn from the *Peace Advocate* that Judge Jay has generously presented to the Peace Society the copy-right of his masterly Review of the Mexican War, and that the owner of the stereotype plates has also given them to the same society, which is making a good use of the gift by printing a cheap edition of the work. The cause of peace and righteousness cannot be better served than by its universal circulation.

THE ROCHESTER ANTI-SLAVERY FAIR.—The proceeds of the Rochester Fair, we learn from the *North Star*, were only about two hundred dollars, a large portion of which will be consumed in defraying its necessary expenses. The *Star* also says that the Fair was morally as well as financially a failure,—which we are sorry to hear, though we do not exactly understand how this could be.

MISSIONARY LABORS IN BEHALF OF THE CRIMINAL.—By the notices in our paper it will be seen that Mr. Charles Spear, editor of The Prisoner's Friend, is now abroad on a tour visiting the prisons of the country, delivering public Addresses and circulating his periodical. Mr. Spear has for years labored to awaken an interest in behalf of criminals and especially of those who are discharged. He has also endeavored to show the inexpediency of the death penalty. His work published on that subject has reached twelve editions, and may be had at this office. We trust our community will aid him in his efforts in this truly Christian work of philanthropy.

Communications.

Three and a-half Weeks in Columbia and Green Counties.

HUDSON, Feb. 7th, 1850.

FRIEND GAY,—We have sent you two papers published in this place, noticing the fact that our meetings here have been disturbed by rowdyism and mobocratic violence. It is due to the other places we have visited in this vicinity that our reception by them should be contrasted with that of Hudson.

When we arrived in this section we had no acquaintance with any person whom we knew to be an Abolitionist. We had been told there were a few friends of the slave scattered here and there, but by referring to our list of subscribers for Anti-Slavery papers we found there were few indeed. Some half dozen, perhaps, in these two counties, standing apart from each other in this frozen region, where nothing of consequence had ever been done in behalf of freedom, and scarcely a meeting been held for years. It seemed almost like going within the arctic circle to sow wheat. Nevertheless we were nothing daunted, for we knew that the fires of liberty and the sunshine of humanity would melt down any amount of icebergs.

We called first on a man of whom we had heard as being friendly to the cause, but who had not given it much attention, yet who was, at least, in favor of the largest liberty of speech. We were cordially received, and he took immediate measures for securing a house and appointing a meeting. By his aid we held six meetings, in Mellenville, having large audiences at the first and which increased up to the last, so that the Methodist church, which was of good size, was quite too small.

At this place we obtained sixteen subscribers for the *Standard*, and scattered a large number of Anti-Slavery books,—the reading of which will, we trust, confirm many in the Anti-Slavery faith and bring them into the work of breaking every yoke.

Notwithstanding we faithfully set forth to the people in Mellenville, as our custom is, the shameful dereliction to Christianity and liberty of the Church and the State, yet we have had several invitations to return and discourse still farther on this great question which is shaking the nation to its very foundation, and we hope to be able to accept them There are those there who desire to "prove all things." There was, however, bitter opposition from certain quarters, yet not so much as was to be expected in a place where this subject has been studiously winked out of sight and the deepest prejudice existed towards it.

While our meetings were in progress in Mellenville we held two meetings in a large school house, a few miles distant, where also, we were heard respectfully, and we scattered a number of books. The Syracuse Convention, at which my husband was in attendance, being in session during these meetings I was alone the principal part of the time.

From Mellenville we went to Leeds on the west side of the river, where we held five meetings, to which the large Dutch Reformed church was opened. We did not have opportunity here to go so fully into an exposition of our principles and measures as in Mellenville, because considerable time was occupied by the defenders of Slavery, the principal of whom was a man by the name of Cummings, whom we recognized as an instigator of a mob in Syracuse some seven years ago. Those who were at the Convention held at that time will not have forgotten him. His course at these meetings was similar to that at Syracuse, though tempered to suit the circumstances Had he found a drunken rabble at Leeds, such as cheered him on at Syracuse, we should no doubt have witnessed similar results. He has been lecturing on temperance latterly yet some of the friends of temperance have no confidence in his integrity in that cause even.

We obtained eight subscribers for the *Standard* at Leeds, and scattered large numbers of books. We hope to go there again and lay the question more fully before them, when we shall expect others to unite in this work with us.

Our next meetings were at Palenville, directly under the deep-furrowed, frowning brow of the old Catskills, and only two miles from the "Mountain House." Here we held four meetings. At the first there seemed an involuntary uprising of the place to defend Slavery or apologize for it. An elderly man called the slaves cattle. We showed the congregation that if he were right they were in the practice of baptizing cattle into the name of the Father and of sitting at the communion table with cattle. We afterwards learned that this man is a rumselling Elder in the church. The Bible was brought forward and quoted in defense of Slavery, and although the minister of the Dutch Church did not think the Bible sanctioned it, he afterwards wanted some explanation of Abraham's position towards those servants born in his house. Indeed had not the subject for that evening's discussion been the terrible system of American Slavery and those who were apologizing for, or defending it, been in high standing in the church or making high professions of Republicanism and Democracy, the whole affair would have been richly ludicrous. It was, however, truly pitiful, and I blushed and grieved for my race.

The three following meetings were quiet, many of the church members having withdrawn, and no one came forward to reply. Yet when we announced our meetings closed, the Dutch Reformed Clergyman, who had attended throughout, but had kept silence since the first meeting, gave notice that he would hold a meeting there the next Thursday evening to show that the Church of Christ had been misrepresented and slandered. Mr. Foster, rising said, if the Church had been misrepresented no one was so deeply interested to know it as himself, as it was not his intention to misrepresent any one; therefore he should endeavor to be present to listen to the discourse. He has gone to-day and will probably stop and reply to-morrow evening.

In Palenville we obtained but five subscribers but several others will probably subscribe while Mr. Foster is there, as there was quite as much interest manifested to obtain information by books as in other places in this section. At our last meeting in Palenville by unanimous vote thanks were tendered us for our lectures, and an invitation given us to return and discuss the question farther.

I will here suggest that next summer a Convention be held in this vicinity, when by the promulgation of truth having swept the charming valley below, we adjourn to the heights above and refresh our spirits by a view of the varied scenery, rich, beautiful, grand and sublime.

From Palenville we came to Hudson, where we have held four meetings—the three first in Temperance Hall which were considerably disturbed by rowdyism, and the last in Friends Meeting House, which being larger and more commodious than the hall, we believed would secure us from further outrage. Yet even hither the rowdies followed and proceeded to still greater extremeties by throwing eggs and other missiles, one of which hit our excellent friend, Aaron C. Macy.

—Although we had designed to hold other meetings in the place we gave notice at the close of this, that at this late period we did not feel it our duty, as in years gone by, to speak in disturbed meetings. The liberty of speech, which had been trampled under foot all through the country was now regained in the North save in a few benighted corners, and we chose to speak elsewhere to those who were eager to listen to this all-absorbing question of the age.

In justice, however, to the masses who attended our meetings it must be said, there was an evident desire to have order, and some of the city authorities were present at all the meetings, save the first, trying to preserve order. Their failure to do so must have been owing to an unpardonable lack of efficiency somewhere. In numerous instances I have seen greater turbulence, from much greater numbers, entirely put down and order preserved by one or two efficient, private citizens. I learn there is a class of rowdies here who have given the place much trouble, for a long time past, in disturbing temperance meetings and in committing other shameful outrages on the citizens, such as taking off gates, tearing up doorsteps, overturning outhouses and the like. If the citizens know of no better means of protection than by physical force, I can assure them their present forceless system is worse than nothing. These river towns are to be commisserated for being infested, during winter, by a set of smoking, drinking, gambling loafers who are thrown out of employment by the closing of navigation. My opinion is, that no physical force will reach the difficulty. Much could be done for the salvation of these places by the preaching of the real gospel in lieu of that soulless sectarianism which has stolen its name, and which is a savor of death unto death instead of life unto life.

We find that throughout all this section, the menhating, God-defying Colonization cause is in all its primitive luxuriance. The General Synod of the Dutch Reformed Church, the highest ecclesiastical judicature of that denomination, recommends that all its ministers preach, at least once a year, a sermon in favor of Colonization, and take up a collection for the Colonization Society; and so far as I can learn the request is heartily responded to.

The work is great, the harvest is ripe for the reaping, and our prayer is to the Executive Committee for more laborers.

ABBY KELLEY FOSTER.

Slave-Labor Products....No. VII.

THE conclusion of our respondent's reply, No. 3, did not arrive to us until our communication No. 6 was prepared to be despatched to New York. Its examination was therefore left to be one of the subjects of the present essay.

Before proceeding to this duty we would recur, in as few words as we can, to the charge, glanced at in the conclusion of our last paper, that "Alpha has the honor of soothing his," the slaveholders, "conscience with the flattering unction that his sins go from him with his stolen goods to their consumers!"

It has been suggested to us that the *color of such an idea* may have been possibly elaborated out of our reply, No. 4 to Adin Ballou's interrogatories—where we say, "The theft goes with the goods, not with the money which never was the slave's, and could not be made his by this juggle between the parties buying and selling;" or in our reply, No 7,—where we say that "the sin of slaveholding" . . . "attaches to the persons who, by using the product, sustain the slaveholding." In the first respect we remark, that in following the apparent lead of our friend's question, though *avoiding* the somewhat equivocal part of the inquiry—"does the theft . . . . remain still *with the slaveholder* in the equivalent received?" we used "theft" in its subjective sense, as noting "the thing stolen," and as being in this connection, the synonym of the expression—"the condition of being stolen." By substituting this expression for the word "theft" our meaning is made unmistakably clear, and "the honor" of suggesting any consolation from it to the conscience of the slaveholder transferred to another party. In the next place we remark that our reply No. 7, does not relieve the slaveholder from the sin of slaveholding by a supposed transmission of his guilt to the consumers of his goods. As well would a parallel remark that the sin of horse-stealing attaches to those who buy stolen horses, sustain the idea of such a transmission of guilt as would leave the first offender innocent of it.

In proceeding to the consideration of our respondent's more recent remarks we would call his attention to the important fact that, in whatever degree we diminish the use of the products of Slavery we diminish the amount of goods given in exchange for those products; and thus we diminish the dealing in those exchanges which seem to be the lion in the way of our friend's progress in Anti-Slavery consistency. Totally to reject the products, would nullify any exchanges for them: and thus the patronage which existed in those exchanges, would be turned into virtuous channels. So far then as a commerce in goods exchanged for the products of Slavery is *causative* of Slavery, the disuse of those products is a DOUBLE BLOW at the hateful institution

Whilst fully accepting the doctrine that any dealing which is promotive of Slavery is prohibited by Anti-Slavery consistency, we cannot perceive that the buying of free goods which at some time have passed in exchange for slave-goods necessarily promotes Slavery; nor can we avoid perceiving that every buying of slave-goods causes a chasm in the market requiring a fresh supply to the amount of the buying. The direct effect of each buying is to encourage the growth and production of the kind of goods it buys—This buying of the goods of Slavery, however remote the wanderings of the buyer may be from the grand centre of the slave system, is felt at that centre, with the certainty that a touch at the remotest part of the spider's web is felt by the monster who sits enthroned at its centre.

But why is our attention so strenuously called to the possible influences, favorable to Slavery, of a commerce in the goods exchanged for the products of Slavery, whilst the certain influence in that direction of the buying of the products themselves which cannot be denied, do not produce the conviction that such buying ought to be avoided. This buying must be recognized as evil ere the propriety of the commerce in the exchange goods can be called in question. We demonstrate geometrical truths by a series of propositions, each forming foundation principles for the next following Did we invert the order, no truths could be shown. The geometrician, who, overlooking the plainer truths which belong to the lines contained within a circle, should direct his primary attention to the more abstruse, and perhaps insoluble ones, which relate to lines out of that circle though touching it, would be thought very deficient in powers of geometrical examination. It is so of moral truths, our arrival at the knowledge of which is by successive steps.

Our friend's course of argument overlooks this order. He does not deny that "in buying the product of the slave's robbery you supply the motive of the robbery," yet he would seek to justify that buying by other connexions with the slaveholder—not apparently within those limits, whereby he "acquires the pecuniary ability and facilities necessary to the prosecution of his business operations." Hi then instances, as such, the loaning of capital to him—the buying of foreign goods of him which he obtained in exchange for his cotton—or the paying him cash for articles which he possessed by means of slaveholding, and which he says are the same in effect and principle as the merchant purchasing his cotton.

In considering the particular cases here given, limiting that in relation to the foreign goods to the forms in which it is stated, we arrive at the same conclusion; and in doing so, in at least two of the instances, confirm our own proposition. To loan capital to the slaveholder is both to hold slaves and to pay in advance for their coercion and robbery;—to buy the foreign goods from him is but to pay him the money for the slave-grown cotton;—to pay the slaveholder cash for other articles possessed by means of slaveholding, is to stimulate him to its practice, whether it take from the slave the product of his labor or not. We agree then that all these relations to Slavery are sinful. Is it the purpose of our friend to prove them to be so? or is it his contrary purpose to prove them to be innocent? Here is the ambiguity which the manner of our respondent's argument makes it needful for him to explain. He should also show wherein Alpha says, "Buying his"—the slaveholder's—"cotton is a great sin," yet "buying his foreign goods, obtained in exchange for cotton, and loaning money to be used in multiplying his human cattle are innocent business transactions." This singular assumption shows, we think, his need of "the *eye-salve* of Free Produce scrupulosity." Had it a real foundation, it could only be evidence that Alpha had mistaken the extent of his doctrine, not its truthfulness.

There is no "puzzling point" in the inquiry, whether it be criminal to loan money to pirate to purchase, equip, or man a new pirate ship, or to pay him money, with a knowledge of that destination of it, for a city lot—whether it be ancestral property, or the product of a recent felony which the buying would sanction. Our "peculiar ethics" do not permit us to promote crime in any way. Would our friend assert the innocency of the transaction. or affirming its guilt, argue inversely from it the innocency of supporting Slavery by as substantial a patronage?

In the degree, that buying goods exchanged for the products of Slavery increases the motive for slaveholding, such buying is wrong. There is not involved in it, however, the usurpation of the slave's property in the products of his labor, which has been the subject of so much argument, and will ever make a broad gulf between what our friend is pleased to call primary and secondary slave products.

In relation to the latter, we asserted that "neither in common law, nor in common sense, could a man be sustained in claiming the money for which a thing was sold. His rights are in the thing stolen." The question had express relation to a supposition that "the theft" passed from the property originally stolen to "the equivalent received." It was to such a supposition we answered, that the man had no claim in that equivalent. Sliding from his own inquiry, he would make us say that the man had no claim to a "reparative equivalent" . . . "in recoverable values of every description possessed by the criminal party;" and he tauntingly demands our legal authority for saying this—which we did not say. If brought to the proof of what we did assert, as it is a negative, it might require the reading of a whole law library. Will our readers tarry while we read it?

Our friend is entitled to all the benefit of the concession that at some point of time, when the enjoyment will cease to create other thefts, stolen goods may come into rightful use. The concession will not however serve his turn in respect to the goods of Slavery while the slave system continues. His appeal to the Judge of all the earth, as to "who will be found twisting with the robber," and his preference "to stand with the *accused* before that judgment seat," is a form of assertion in which we cannot join, and in which there is no argument. * *

Brother Ballou vainly disclaims his "fellowship with those wicked human conventions which declare, or regard, men as 'chattels personal,'" when he asserts that "we blunt the public sentiment by falsely assuming that the slave is still a *proprietor* deeply wronged by somebody's stealing his property" Do our blows fall less thick and heavy on the MAN-THEFT because we point to its ☞ purpose?

The remark that "It now appears that the Hon. Isaac E. Morse, is not so much 'a cat rolled in meal' as an impudent pettifoger under fee by the slaveholders to clear them of all guilt by charging the whole of it on the 'cupidity of the North,'" is at least evidence of this—that the a row of a stinging sarcasm, sped by the Louisiana Congressman, has found a lodgment *somewhere*.

We now come to our respondent's reply, No. 4. It commends the cool and easy manner in which we proceed with the discussion; asserts that we re-affirm what he freely admits, repeat what has been already stated, take for granted the main things to be proved, confound important moral distinctions, and boldly assume our grand conclusion as *undeniable*; but it does not state what we re-affirm, what we repeat, what we take for granted, what distinctions we confound, and wherein we assume as undeniable our grand conclusion, so that we are left just where we before were, as to any knowledge of our points of agreement and disagreement. He represents us as the eagle gyrating on complacent wing, circling round and round in the fleecy vapor of our *generalisms*, far beyond the reach of his puny missiles, but he does not say that we have failed to look steadily to our point, or to remember that "surely in vain the net is spread in sight of any bird." Our's has been the task to avoid being carried away by sophisms without force, and suggestions without application to our case; and our's the duty to stand steadfastly on fundamental truths. He complains that his efforts to reach us by argument are in vain, and would be, were he to continue them for a decade. We "have a certain instinctive *feeling*," he says, "that it is a sin to use slave products, which has taken a certain form of manifestation from certain leading minds of the past, precisely as plain dress and plain speech have, but which will not bear the strict analysis of reason." "This scruple,' he says," is founded on no fundamental principle of universal application, follows no general analogy, and extends to no general classification of cases in common practice!" All which is quoted, and much more might be, to show that the quiver of our friend's arguments is nearly exhausted. Now for the allegations: He avers that "free producers are perfectly willing to carry on commerce with slaveholders in articles obtained in exchange for slave-labor products, whilst they deem it exceedingly sinful to use a cotton handkerchief manufactured and sold in New England, merely because one tenth of its value was created by slave labor, or was stolen as they say, from the *poor slave*;"—as if free producers were willing to engage in any commerce promotive of Slavery, or as if that miserable rag was a solitary specimen of southern barbarity, and was neither part nor parcel of a vast amount of product wrung from the toil of the scourged and bleeding slave at the demand of New England, and which demand carried to the slave, besides the wrongs so done, other misery and a premature death! He avers "such notions" "are comparatively harmless so long as they are not magnified into an artificial importance which thrusts aside, or underrates really well founded, meritorious, efficient and indispensable Anti-Slavery instrumentalities;"—as if the jewel of consistency was not properly a part of any really well-founded moral instrumentalities. He avers that "they ascend the rostrum, claim to be the *great all in all*, and underrate everything else, even vital measures, as of little or no account," as if while seeking to show *why* fetters are made for the slave, and expressing their sympathies for him by self denial of the *cause*, they should relax their efforts by every available means to break them.

Mr. Ballou further says, that we have brought forward certain general propositions, axioms, &c., to which we know he assents, but he thinks he has succeeded in showing that "our application of them to this cause is a *mis*-application." We should like to know where he has attempted to show this, and how he has succeeded in drawing a ring around this case, which has excluded it from the operation of principles which are fundamental to morality and of universal force.

The appendix which our friend proposes to the "legend" lacks the internal authority which would justify its addition to the original. We are

profess that something ought to be done, though what that something should be they, as long as they can, abstain from declaring.

The art of Government in England, as practised by both parties, the Whigs and the Tories, is the art of mystification—the day of brute force is gone by, and the pratice of delusion as to the causes of the evil under which we are the most heavily taxed of any people in the universe, are kept out of sight—that curse has been, prior to the Revolution, Class power—Brute force in the hands of a class, and since then Class legislation.

When Englishmen raised themselves from serfdom into a sort of free-negroism the Barons were by degrees obliged to grant them more and more freedom, and to accomplish by fraudulent legislation under the name of a Constitutional Monarchy, that inroad in the people's pockets which has reduced them to a state of semi-slavery "free born" Englishmen.

When in the time of The Spectator, the Father and Guardian, it was perceived by the dominant class that the people would grow in wisdom too rapidly for the interests of the Rulers, and that political knowledge would be dangerous to their system of Government. They immediately stamped the political press and thus shut up knowledge into a very few newspapers, which could not be issued at a price which the people could afford to give, and during all the time, or nearly all the time that the aristocracy were contracting the enormous debt of eight hundred millions, and enacting that *that* debt should be laid on the shoulders of the then unborn, the stamp upon newspapers was gradually increased until no daily newspaper could be issued under the price of sixpence.

During that time too the Government fanned all the prejudices of the people and kept them in that state of excited ignorance, that one half could be easily set upon the other, even at home, whenever the Clergy chose to excite the ignorant against the Catholics; and the Catholic priests took as steady a care to preserve their sway over the minds of their still more mentally dense devotees, and thus the purposes of the Aristocracy were answered by keeping attention from off Government and the causes of the evils that distressed them.

Remember that in my letter of last week I showed that forty seven millions of pounds sterling (not dollars mind) out of fifty-four millions, the amount of taxes raised from the pockets of the laborers of this country, was disbursed in paying the interest of the debt and sustaining our Army and Navy, and that in a time of peace,—twenty-eight millions being the interest of the debt, and the other nineteen millions for War, and the greater proportion of which last is distributed amongst the Aristocracy, their children and relations.

This is now becoming a fact, patent to the minds of a very large proportion of the people; to all indeed except the poor peasantry who live upon wages averaging 8s. per week, and their families averaging between four and five persons.

Out of seeming evil God is still educing good, for in consequence of the pressure of the Stamp Law upon newspapers, and the working classes being thereby shut out from the stamped vehicle, the unstamped press, so called, has grown into great popularity and immense circulation, notwithstanding the Law; for Government, though they every now and then, exert themselves ruinously and destructively upon those they select as victims, are nevertheless obliged to wink at the evasion, and it is notorious that the people have a political literature of their own which is owing to these unjust laws impregnated with a deal of antagonism and bitterness to the Government and all in authority; and throws a haze over every good step which they do take, and alienates the people by emblazoning every erroneous step, or which can be looked at with a jaundiced eye and magnified by hostile pens.

True it is that our Aristocracy and hereditary irresponsible legislators have well justified the hostile feeling which exists, but the bad policy of preventing their own friends from resorting to cheap literature to meet the minds of the people leaves the hereditary class undefended against the growing hostility of the many towards the aristocracy.

—This is shewn in the reviews of the smaller literature as well as the current remarks in the current political events of the day.

I cut from the same number of the penny publication, from which I took two extracts in my last letter, the following notice of one of the many cheap attacks continually issuing from the press:

"THE FOUR P's."—Under this quaint title, Mr. George Hows has given a sound and hearty lashing to the authors of those grievances which are continually weighing us down, and reducing the country daily into a more desperate condition. The three first P's, Princes, Peers, and Priests, united as they are to crush the fourth P, the People, are shown no mercy in this little publication, and as a specimen of the whole we select the

PEERS,

Of whom Blackstone very gravely says, "The lords are an aristocratical assembly of persons selected for their piety, their wisdom, their valor, and their property." How very funny *all* this sounds in the year 1849 *Selected?* By whom? *Self-selected* is the proper term, Mr. B. Their "piety," truly; the piety of the peers of England! In what does it consist? Why, in maintaining the State Church for the purpose of clutching for their order the highest prizes. The "wisdom." forsooth! Who ever heard of hereditary wisdom? Wisdom is neither inheritance nor legacy; wisdom often walks in clouted shoes. Oh! let us hear no more about hereditary wisdom. But they have been selected for their *property* also. Too true is it that they have been so selected; yea, they have regarded, do regard, property more than they estimate the flesh and blood of men, women, and children. Sweet indeed might be the use of property, in teaching the ignorant in delivering the poor from the fangs of the oppressor, and binding up the broken-hearted, in visiting the widow and the fatherless. But property in the hands of the aristocracy is greatly used to effect the moral and political degradation of those to whom it owes its value. With our nobles (and others, too,) property too often accumulates to crush and to corrupt. Truly has Lamartine said "The epoch when aristocracies fall is that in which nations regenerate themselves." Another French writer says "The English aristocracy is the last remnant of the feudal institutions in Europe; and England is the battle ground on which the contest for its extinction must be fought out." And M. Passy thus writes, "Woe to those nations when the magnificence of the few displays itself at the expense of the many! Such is the state of Great Britain." * * *

Again as a specimen of the facts which are illuminated from the press and put before the people in a cheap form—take the following:

PLACEMEN AND PENSIONERS.—It appears from a Parliamentary return that there are 841 placemen and pensioners who receive out of the public purse upwards of £21,000 a year; viz:—

	Total Emoluments.	Average income.
252 civil officers	469 950	1,865
164 judicial officers	419 837	2,559
74 diplomatic and consular officers	178 540	2 410
35 naval officers	44 166	1 261
158 military officers	322 941	2 045
30 ordinance officers	30,170	1,005

You know or have read the history of what is called our National Anthem, for not singing which when it pleased any public party at a dinner to propose it, men used, even in my day and generation, to get insulted and abused. That has turned to account, substituting the people for the reigning prince, by Ebenezer Elliot:

THE PEOPLE'S ANTHEM.

BY EBENEZER ELLIOT.

When wilt thou save the People?
Oh, God of mercy, when?
Not kings and lords, but nations!
Not thrones and crowns, but men!
Flowers of thy heart, oh God, are they,
Let them not pass like weeds away,
Their heritage a winter's day.

God save the People!

Shall crime breed crime for ever,
Strength aiding still the wrong?
Is it thy will, oh Father,
That man shall toil for wrong?
"No!" say thy mountains. "No!" thy skies;
"Man's clouded sun shall brightly rise,
And songs ascend instead of sighs."

God save the People!

When wilt thou save the people!
Oh, God of mercy, when?
The People, Lord, the People!
Not thrones, and crowns, but men!
God save the People! thine they are,
Thy children, as the angels fair;
Save them from bondage and despair.

God save the People!

The ideas which are thus put by Elliot before the people, and which are now drank in by them with avidity, have reference to the rights of them instead of our idolatrous reference to princes; and the disposition of the people to drink in these thoughts has been largely increased by an attempt to suppress political knowledge. Thus the sins of Aristocracy are finding them out—their acts are cutting their own legs from under them, and they are preparing this old country to throw them off. Their sins in Ireland where they had crushed and starved the people until starvation and Ireland have become identical terms, have resulted in placing the interest of many millions upon the shoulders of the English People, and the English people know this and that starvation in Ireland falls upon the taxation of England.

ABRAHAM TUCKER.

Congressional.

SENATE, Washington, Tuesday, Feb. 5.

MR. CLAY'S SPEECH.

On motion of Mr. MANGUM, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the special order: the resolutions, submitted a few days since by Mr. CLAY.

Mr. CLAY arose to address the Senate. After a few remarks in relation to the feelings of self-distrust with which he rose to address the Senate upon a question of such great and vital importance, he proceeded with a brief statement of the various causes of danger which now threaten the Union. He examined the motives of those who had produced the existing state of agitation; contending that partizan strife, irrespective of considerations of the public good, had brought upon us a state of things in which even the House of Representatives of the United States could spend weeks in the attempt to elect a Door-keeper, not because of the difficulty of finding a person possessing the competent qualifications for so unimportant an office, but because the elements of discord which threatened the glorious Union had been introduced. He alluded to the state of feeling existing among the people in the States, and in their Legislatures. He desired in the commencement of his remarks, to assure any who could suppose that this important question was to be made a means of securing high place and power, that so far as he was concerned, when he had fulfilled the duty which had been assigned him by his State, unsolicited, his mission in connection with public affairs was closed; and closed, if his wishes could pervail forever.

Mr. CLAY then took up his resolutions and proceeded to remark upon them. He did not present this measure with the request that it should be adopted, precisely as he had introduced it. If it was susceptible of amendment, which would make it more acceptible, he hoped it would be made. His objects would be secured if by any means the great question of agitation might be settled, and the integrity of the Union preserved. The question must be discussed in a spirit of conciliation, and settled in the spirit of compromise. His object had been to present the measure which, in this spirrt would afford a platform upon which both sections of the country could unite. The first resolution related to the admission of California, with her Constitution into the Union.

Mr. Clay proceeded by citation of precedents, and cogent argument, to show that such course was the only proper one, and that it involved no concession on the one side or the other. The second Resolution called upon those who had set their hearts upon the adoption of the Wilmot Proviso—in view of the danger which threatens the Union in consequence of the agitation of that measure—for the sake of peace, and good feeling, to yield up that measure in return. He had felt bound, in the spirit of mutual concession, to offer something in return for the surrender of this favorite principle, or measure. He had proposed, therefore in return, to declare two truths, which he considered clear and indisputable: 1st, that by law, Slavery no longer exists in the Territories ceded to the United States by Mexico; and 2d, that in our opinion, it would not go there under any circumstances. He proceeded to enquire whether these were truths—arguing the affirmative of the proposition, from the history of the negotiation of the late treaty with Mexico, and a reasonable construction of the operation of the Constitution, and other conceded grounds. The institution of Slavery, in his opinion, presented two entirely distinct grounds—Slavery with the States, and Slavery without the States. Congress had no right to interfere with Slavery in the States, and if the time could arrive when Congress attempted to so interfere with the institution, then his voice would be for war. Then he would feel that the South were bound to resist so unconstitutional and aggressive a measure, with all the means which God or Nature had placed in their hands. He pictured the evils to result from a civil war arising from such a state of things—stating that it would be one in which we would receive no sympathy from the world. The next question was, has Congress any power over Slavery out of the States? He contended that it had, and that while a want of control over the institution in the States was indisputable, its control out of the States is at least a debateable question—one upon which men might reasonably differ, the decision of which consequently, no matter how settled, should not give rise to ill feeling and disunion. This position also Mr. Clay supported, with a lengthened argument, drawn from the Constitution and other sources.

—Among illustrations was the following: Suppose Congress were led to think that a greater revenue might be derived from the sale of the public lands, by the inhibition or admission of Slavery into the territories, would not Congress have the right under the power to sell, either to introduce or prohibit that institution? He contended, also, that Congress had such control over the territories under the treaty-making power—all must admit that the power existed somewhere—that it could not be annihilated. Mexico, certainly, when she held the sovereignty of the newly acquired territories had such power, and having ceded her sovereignty to the United States by treaty this Government is vested with the same power under that treaty; dispute that point who can, said Mr. Clay. The right to acquire, also gave us the power over this subject, for, in the language of the Supreme Court, if we have the right to acquire, we have the right also to govern. He next proceeded to inquire whether Slavery was likely to be introduced into the new territories. California herself had asserted the negative of the proposition, and the soil and climate of the remainder forbid any other view. Why, then if these truths were evident, as they must be to a large majority of the Senate,—why should they not be prepared to announce them to the world? He believed, also, that the sentiment of the people of the whole country would now support the expression of those truths. When Representatives from the North had left their homes to enter upon their duties here, their constituents did not know that California had unanimously decided to prohibit the institution of Slavery; if that fact had been known prior to the exciting action of various Legislatures and sections, who could believe that this agitation would ever have reached the present crisis. The third and fourth resolutions related to the question of the boundaries of Texas. Mr. Clay considered this question at length, arguing the propriety of paying that State a consideration, for the relinquishment of such title as she may have, with a view to settle the perplexing question of boundary, as well as to aid in the settlement of the great national question of agitation. He then read to the Senate a statement showing the necessity for the establishment of a Territorial Government in New Mexico, and expressed the determination not to let the session of Congress close without an effort being made at least for the extension of adequate laws over that Territory, for the protection of its people. He was not one of those who believed that the Supreme Court should be left to decide all great questions. There were questions which ought not to go to that tribunal. Whether this question of the Boundary of Texas, was one of them, or not, he could not, he would not decide. He thought, however, that it was one which Congress, under all the circumstances, could and ought to settle.

Having concluded his argument, relative to the boundary of Texas, and his advocacy of the proposition to pay her an adequate sum for the Territory to be yielded up to be appropriated to the payment of the debt contracted by the Republic of Texas, for which she pledged the revenue derivable from customs, Mr. Clay yielded to a motion by Mr. Foote to postpone the further consideration of the subject until to-morrow, which was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. MANGUM, adjourned at 3 o'clock.

SENATE, Wednesday, Feb. 6.

NORTH-CAROLINA ON SLAVERY AGITATION.

After presentation of petitions, Mr. MANGUM presented resolutions adopted by a meeting of citizens of Wilmington, North Carolina, adverse to legislation, by Congress, on the question of Slavery, with a few remarks, in which he asserted what he believed to be the rights and the feelings of the South. The South had reached a point where they had planted their foot, and upon which, by the blessing of God, they expected to stand and defy all efforts to despoil them of their rights, whether by force or otherwise. She would never consent to legislative action which shall deprive them of an equal participation in the territories acquired from Mexico.

Mr. HALE objected to the reception of the resolution, and proceeded to say, that Mr. Mangum himself, had, early in the session, said, that when any papers looking to any action of the Government, adverse to Slavery were presented here, and objected to, the question was taken upon receiving them, and the motion was laid on the table. Mr. Hale simply desired that the rule should be allowed to work with reference to papers on the Southern side of the question also, and that the motion to receive these resolutions should also be laid upon the table. The gentleman has accused the North of aggression. He would like that gentleman to point out the first line, or word, by the North, which was aggressive—so far from that, the whole history of the North shows their course has been concession, until their very women and children were upbraiding them for it. He made his motion simply to give gentlemen an opportunity to show the appropriateness of Justice and Equality.

The question being taken upon the motion, it was rejected by—Yeas 2 Nays 46.

MR. CLAY'S SPEECH.

The Senate resumed the consideration of Mr. Clay's resolutions, and Mr. Clay arose and continued his remarks. After a few additional words in support of the proposition to pay the debts of Texas, he proceeded with an argument in support of his resolution, relative to the institution of Slavery in the Federal District, contending that it cannot be abolished there, in good faith, without the conditions named in the resolution. With those conditions, the prohibition of the slave trade in the District, which he proposed, involved concession by neither section of the Union. All admitted the right of the States to prohibit the slave trade within their borders, and the right had been exercised by Southern States—Kentucky among others. Surely, then, upon this point, both sections might and ought to make common cause. He held that it might be abolished without just offence to any portion of the Union. There surely was a power of abolition somewhere, and the Constitution having vested exclusive jurisdiction over the District in Congress alone, it possessed that power or else it existed nowhere. But although the power to abolish Slavery here was thus vested, yet in view of the evident wishes, intention and understanding of the framers of the Constitution, in making this grant, such abolition could not be effected without the assent of the States who ceded their Territory for the purpose of establishing a seat of government. Virginia had taken back her portion of the District, and Maryland alone, had a claim upon the implied faith of Congress, to which he had alluded upon the introduction of his resolution.

The next resolution provides that more effectual measures shall be taken to give effect to the constitutional provision, relative to the re-capture of slaves. On this question he would go with him who goes farthest; he held that not only every officer of the Government, but every man in the community was bound to assist in the arrest, and delivering up of fugitives from labor, as certainly as fugitives from justice. He felt that the South had great cause of complaint on this subject in view of the difficulties which were intentionally, and violently, thrown in the way of the recovery of their property. These impediments are the result of bad neighborhood, and evidence of unkind feeling on the part of those who instituted them. The laws upon the subject were evidently ineffective, and he considered it the duty of Congress, and he hoped the free States themselves would, ere long, consider it their duty to pass laws regulating this matter as the Constitution provided, and as the spirit of kindness and good neighborhood dictated. After a brief allusion to the principle asserted in his last resolution, Mr. Clay proceeded with an appeal in support of his whole proposition. If gentlemen did not approve his plan, let them bring theirs forward, and if they could suggest any which would command more unanimity, and secure a better spirit, and more cordial support, he would gladly give way for it. When he was considering his plan, prior to its introduction to the Senate, he had thought of the Missouri Compromise; but he did not think that a measure suited to the present exigency. He gave an interesting history of the Missouri Compromise, showing his connection with that subject, and correcting errors which had arisen relative to his course at that time. He next contrasted his present scheme of compromise with the Missouri Compromise, with a view to asking Senators which of them was under the present circumstances, the most reasonable or feasible? The Senator from Missouri had said the other day, that he would never be satisfied with anything short of a positive recognition of Slavery, South of the line of 36 deg 30 min. He put it to gentlemen, whether they could suppose that such a proposition could receive twenty votes in this body, or a proportionate vote in the other House? It was opposed to the principle of non-interference. The true policy was to keep the whole Territory untouched by legislation of Congress, with respect to Slavery. It was said that non-legislation would be equivalent to exclusion of Slavery; that could not be helped. If nature had interdicted the institution, who could be complained of except nature, or nature's God? Mr. C. reviewed the past history of our country, exhibiting its progress and prosperity in most forcible language. In alluding to the Mexican war, he paid a high compliment to him who had been raised by his countrymen to the highest position in their gift, mainly in consequence of his brilliant military achievements. He also paid a glowing tribute to the merits of General Scott, who, in point of science, skill, strategy, bravery—all that makes the soldier, was excelled by no military hero in the history of the world. He went on to show, by reference to the action of Congress on various questions of great national interest, that the South had always had the preponderance of the administration of the Government, if she had not the numerical power. It was Southern votes that had carried, or put down, every great measure. In the acquisition of territory, in particular, the South had ever been the beneficiary. By far the greatest portion of the territory acquired was Slave territory, and he submitted now, to Southern gentlemen, whether upon this first application for the admission of Free territory, if it was fair to present the attitude of opposition which had been assumed, even this morning, by a Senator who had presented resolutions relating to the subject. But, suppose the Union were dissolved, what remedy would a state of disunion afford? Could slaveholders better enforce their rights, as owners, to the recapture of their fugitive?—Would the institutions be more secure in the District of Columbia, than now? Would not in such a case one hundred slaves escape where one now does? Finally—would the South be more safe in the possession of their property within the States? He contended that they would not. War, and a dissolution of the Union, he contended were identical and inseparable. Dissolution could only be effected by consent, or War. Consent, no one supposed, would ever be conceded, and even if it were given, War between the Free and Slave States would ensue in less than sixty days. The result would be the establishment of three independent Confederacies, one of the North, the second of the Southern Atlantic States, and the third of the States of the Valley of the Mississippi. For one, he was for staying in the Union, instead of flying out of it. He designed staying within it, and to defy all efforts to deprive him of his rights, and of his privilege to defend those rights by the sword if necessary; but he would never consent to be driven out of it without ceremony. The adoption of the Union was a marriage bond which could never be dissolved and from which those who entered into it could never be divorced. Let them remain together, live together, and dwell in peace, harmony, and good feeling. What would be the result of a war arising from disunion? Its termination would be the extinction of our Republic. The war would be carried on with unrelenting ferocity, until both parties being exhausted, some Cæsar, Alexander, or Napoleon would step in, cut the "Gordian Knot," solve the problem of the capacity of a people for self-government, and crush our liberties and our institutions in the dust. In view of all the dangers which threatened the Union, the disastrous results which were seen to be the inevitable consequence of certain measures which had been agitated, he implored Senators by their love of country, by all that was sacred and dear in the glorious institutions of our Republic, to pause before they took the heedless, fatal leap into an abyss from which the Republic might never be rescued.

SENATE, Feb. 8.

DISSOLUTION OF THE UNION.

The CHAIR stated the first business before the Senate was the question on reception of memorial of citizens of Delaware and Pennsylvania, asking a peaceful Dissolution of the Union.

Mr. DOUGLASS gave the reasons for which he would vote against the reception. He believed that all memorials, excepting those coming from Legislatures of States, which agitate the Slavery question, should be rejected, whether they come from the North or the South.

Mr. STURGEON said he had examined the petition, and pronounced it spurious; it was the act of some black-hearted Abolitionist, who had taken this course for the purpose of disgracing the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. HALE had the Clerk read a letter, in which the petition had been enclosed to him, showing it was *bona fide*.

Mr. DAWSON read a lecture to Mr. Hale, for presenting a petition asking so treasonable an act by Congress, as Dissolution—he was culpable in thus allowing himself to be made the instrument of wicked and designing men.

Mr. HALE said that the forcible dissolution of the Union had been threatened here, time after time, and no objections had been made—he objected then to this pouring out of indignation upon his devoted head, because he had presented a memorial from non-resistants who asked to have the same thing done without force. After further deba by Mr. Underwood and Mr. Davis of Mass., Mr. Foote made some remarks, a portion of which Mr. Hale construed as an intimation that the speeches which he (Mr. Foote) made, were the result of castigations which he received: if that was so, Mr Hale appealed to the letter writers and reporters, in the name of the Senate and of humanity, not to castigate the Senator from Mississippi, for in so doing they punished the Senate. [Great and long continued laughter]

Mr. DAVIS, of Miss., opposed the reception.

Mr. SEWARD gave notice of an amendment directing a reference of the memorial to the Judiciary Committee, with instruction to report that they have no power and no disposition to consider the measure. He stated that he agreed with the opinions expressed by John Quincy Adams, that for the vindication of the right of petition all petitions ought to be received, but it was incumbent upon the House receiving improper petitions, to take immediate measures for expressing disapprobation of them. He condemned the prayer of this petition as he always had such propositions. He had no fear of Dissolution—Congress had no power to take measures to effect Dissolution—none but madmen would propose it, and he had made it a rule in reference to madmen, to have no controversy with them.—[Laughter]

After some further conversation, the further consideration of the subject was postponed until to-morrow.

MR. HOUSTON'S SPEECH.

The Senate then preceeded to the consideration of Mr. Houston's resolution, presented some time since, relative to the power of Congress over the subject of Slavery. Mr. Houston proceeded to address the Senate at length upon the whole subject of Slavery, assuming a middle ground, and asserting that the question would be settled at once were it not for the intemperate course pursued by the extremes of both sections. He reviewed the course of prominent men, in both sections, upon this subject, and enjoined conciliation, mutual forbearance and concession, which alone could save this Union. He pictured also the evils which must result from disunion, showing that neither North, South, nor West, could be prosperous except by the blending of common interests. He also considered the proposed Southern Convention; it was a measure calculated for evil, and inexcusable. Where had it originated? It was thought advisable not to originate the movement in South Carolina, because of an unfortunate condition of things which existed there.

Mr. BUTLER desired to know to what the gentleman alluded.

Mr. HOUSTON said he referred to the Nullification movements. He was out of the country at the time, and his recollection was altogether historical.

In the course of a conversation which ensued Mr. Foote asked Mr. Houston whether he meant to intimate that, on the subject of the Southern Convention, or any other, the people of Mississippi were, or had been, governed by political dictators or leaders?

Mr. HOUSTON said that was a very delicate and comprehensive question. (Great laughter.)

Mr. FOOTE and Mr. DAVIS both denied that the people of Mississippi were governed by leaders.

Mr. BUTLER wished to say a word relative to a matter of history. It had been intimated that the Southern Address had originated in South Carolina. He desired to say here on his own respousibility, that that Address did not originate in South Carolina, nor with either of her Senators or Representatives. His colleague (Mr. Calhoun) had no participation in originating that paper; nor did he write the call for the meeting which adopted it; nor did he know anything of it, in fact until after two or three meetings had been held with reference to it. The movement was first suggested in his (Mr. Butler's) room, by Mr. Foote and Mr. Huster. They felt that a spirit of madness had seized upon the North, and in the belief that some decisive action by the South was absolutely necessary, with the energy and independence which characterized them both, took measures to secure an expression of views, and declaration of rights, such as had been issued.

Mr. HOUSTON said he did not sign the address, and designed to cast no reflections on those who did—his object was simply to express his own dissent to their action. He then proceeded with some general remarks, closing with an invocation of dispassionate forbearance and patriotic consideration of the subject. Such action would speedily and amicably adjust all difficulties, and knit together still more closely the bonds of union. He had not deserted from the South—our country was a unit—it knew no fractions, North, South, East, or West—all formed one country—one and indivisible. [Applause.] But if the Union was dissolved, he trusted that his veins might be bursted—that its ruins might be the monument of his grave. He desired no epitaph to tell that he had survived the wreck of the Republic. [Applause.]

After the presentation of several petitions, adjourned to Monday.

SENATE, Monday, February 11.

DISSOLUTION OF THE UNION.

The Vice President stated the business before the Senate to be, the motion to receive a petition of citizens of Delaware and Maryland, asking a peaceful dissolution of the Union. Mr. Chase, having the floor, addressed the Senate in support of the petition. He cited a case wherein a similar petition had been frequently quoted in discussion. He believed that the Senate were bound to receive every petition no matter what character, and if it exhibted a mistaken view of the powers of Congress, or the expediency of the measure prayed for, Congress should express its disapprobation by subsequent action. The right of petition was a great and sacred one, to be demanded; and, not a poor one to be begged for. He had no objection to whatever action the Senate might deem proper to give to this and similar petitions. He only asked that all be received and treated alike.

Mr. DAYTON said, that the right of petition was well settled. It was the remedy which a citizen or subject had towards the sovereign, and he had yet to learn that it extended to the destruction of the sovereign. It was limited always to the redress of grievances. He was opposed to the reception of this petition, and would vote against it, because it asked the destruction of the sovereign—the dissolution of the Union—the violation of the constitution by those who had sworn to support it. It asked what the Senate had neither the right nor the power to do, and was not respectful to the body to whom it was addressed.

He agreed with all that Mr. Hale had said the other day, relative to the petition from North Carolinia presented by Mr. Mangum; there were wrongs, as had been said on both sides, and was prepared, and hereafter always should vote against receiving these agitating petitions, no matter where they came from.

Mr. CASS honored the right of petition as much as any man, but he did not reckon it so high as the Senator from Ohio. The people, thank God, had a much more effectual remedy in their hands than the right of petition—they had the right of action. The ballot box was worth a thousand rights of petition, and could be exercised by all the people. Was it to be contended that Congress had no discretion as to the reception of petitions? Would they consider themselves bound to receive a petition asking Congress to pass an act declaring that there was no God? Surely not. The Constitution secured the right to the people of petitioning for the redress of grievances—would any man contend this was such a petition? There was no comparison between this petition and that presented by Mr. Mangum.

He alluded to the blessings with which a kind Providence had crowned our country, and said that the root of all our evil was to be found in our failure to appreciate and render to the Creator the meed of gratitude, for all that we have received. Dissolution was but another name for War—and yet, here were the descendants of Penn asking that it might be granted. If their prayer was to be granted, our borders, wherever they may be, would be the scene of one of the bloodiest Wars the world ever saw—and for what? What was to be gained by it? Who were to reap anything but the bitterest fruits.

Mr. WEBSTER regretted that this petition had been presented, and he would be surprised if it received any votes in the Senate. Lest any one, should, by his vote, imply that Congress had any power over the subject, he thought that the petition, to be consistent with itself, ought to have been preceded by a preamble somewhat as follows:

"Gentlemen, Members of Congress: Whereas, at the commencement of the present session, you and each of you, took a solemn oath upon the Holy Evangelist of Almighty God, that you would support the Constitution and the Government; now, therefore, we ask you to take immediate steps to break up the Union, and destroy the Constitution as soon as you can."

Mr. HALE was glad that Mr. Cass had obtained new light, since he voted the other day against receiving a petition from Pennsylvania, asking no action by Congress, but simply requesting Congress, in view of contemplated action upon the subject of Slavery, on the admission of new States, not to admit such States in the Union. The Senator had declared that North Carolinia was right in remonstrating against the contemplated action by Congress, that was all the petition which Mr. Cass had voted against.

Mr. CASS replied that the petition in question contemplated adverse action by Congress, in case of the application by a new State for admission without a restriction upon the question of Slavery.

Mr. HALE said the petition intimated no such sentiments.

Mr. WALES stated that he had examined the petition and recognized the name of no one of its signers as a citizen of Delaware.

Mr. COOPER then addressed the Senate adverse to the petition, and in support of the Union, alluding to the evils which must follow its dissolution, and declaring that he would vote against all petitions from either North or South, looking in the remotest degree to so disastrous an event.

Mr. CLEMENS declared that the South had never been guilty of aggressing—the North alone was responsible for the danger which menaced the Union—there were no dissolutionists in the South—not a man who would dare rise and avow the treasonable sentiment.

Mr. CHASE said the question of reception had not been met. Mr. Cass and others had passed over the real question, and stated the reasons for which they would not grant the prayer of the petition. They mistook their own position. He contended that the reception of the petition was no test as to the principle involved in the petition.

Mr. SEWARD wished the Senate and the country distinctly to understand that the question was not upon the propriety of dissolving the Union, or the power of Congress to dissolve it, but simply whether the petition should be received, and referred to a Committee, with instructions to report that the Senate has neither the power nor the disposition to entertain the question.—With this view, he would vote to receive the petition, which he had denounced as emanating from madmen—that he had never seen, and never expected to see, the petition which he would not receive. It was no apology with him for refusing to receive the prayer of his fellow-being, that he had no power to grant it.

Petitions from madmen were at least harmless, and the easiest way to get rid of them was to receive them, and dispose of them as they deserved. No other petitions for a dissolution of the Union would ever be sent here, if the present one should be received and the rebuke administered to it which was in the heart and mouth of any man in the Chamber. The Senate were not above giving reasons even against a dissolution of the Union—George Washington had not been above it, and why should the Senate?

The question being taken, the motion to receive the petition was negatived, yeas 3, nays 50; Messrs. Hale, Chase and Seward voting in the affirmative.

The Senate proceeded to the consideration of the order of the day.

Mr. BERRIEN arose and addressed the Senate on the subject of Slavery, expressing his views of the magnitude and difficulties of the subject, and consequent conviction of the crisis which now exists in the affairs of the country. The people of the South had at last been awakened to a sense of their danger, and a feeling had been awakened which could no longer be trifled with.—He uttered no menaces, and trusted the North would heed the voice of calm, dispassionate warning which is now raised. The country had passed through many crises, but none so fraught with danger as the present; and, unless better counsels prevail than hitherto, the direct consequences will ensue.

He trusted that a better feeling would prevail. This hope amounted almost to conviction, that the storm would lull, and peace and happiness would again be diffused throughout all our borders. After paying a most beautiful tribute to Mr. Clay, wishing that he might long live to participate in the blessing of unity and peace, and that when he should at last be called to lay off the frail garment which he has so gracefully worn, his closing eyes might rest on a free, united, happy republic.

Mr. BERRIEN proceeded with an argument upon the immediate question of legislation, for the territories, and against the establishment of a principle which should forbid, in all future time, the flag of the Union to float over any State or Territory where Slavery may exist, except in those States that institution now exists. The South called upon Congress not to legislate upon the question of Slavery. They had not asked legislative aid; it was legislative interference which they deprecated. They called upon Congress to exercise whatever power it had, to organize governments for the Territories, and abstain from any action upon the domestic institution of Slavery. They called upon Congress to leave the Slavery question to the great Constitutional arbiter between the two sections. That was all the South asked: What then, he would appeal to the Senator from Kentucky, (Mr. Clay,) what had the South to yield? What was it that they had to yield? Was it their constitutional right to invoke the decision of the highest tribunal in the Union, that they were called upon to give up? Surely such a demand could never be entertained. He then proceeded to examine more specifically the question of the power of Congress to take any action upon the question of Slavery in the new Territories, arguing against the existence of any such power.

At three o'clock, Mr. Berrien gave way to a motion that the further consideration of the subject be postponed until to-morrow, which was agreed to.

General Intelligence.

AWFUL CATASTROPHE!

EXPLOSION AND DREADFUL LOSS OF LIFE.

The most terrible catastrophe that has occurred in this city for many years, happened on Monday morning the 4th instant, in Hague-st. near Pearl—a catastrophe involving a greater loss of life than ever before inflicted this city from a similar cause.

The large machine shop and printing press manufactory of A. B. Taylor & Co. 3 Hague st. had just been supplied with a new boiler for the steam engine. It was located in the basement of the building, which was six stories high.

At about half-past seven o'clock on Monday morning the boiler exploded, the force passing upward and outward toward the street, crushing the building into a mass of ruins in less than one minute. We never saw a wreck so complete; the walls, floors, large timbers and roof lie in one compact pile, all on fire, and seething, smoking and steaming beneath the flood of water poured upon them.

As usual on Monday mornings, the fireman had started the fires under the boiler at an earlier hour than usual, on account of its getting cold while standing unused over Sunday, and hardly had steam been raised, and motion communicated to the shafting, when the explosion took place, and in an instant the upper part of the building was blown completely off, and fire communicated to the remainder.

The force of the explosion dashed in the windows, frames and doors of several adjoining buildings, and seriously endangered the walls of Hull & Sons' large soap and candle factory, which adjoined the ruined building.

The windows and doors across Hague-st. and in the rear of houses in Pearl-st. were burst in as if with cannon shot, and everything around indicates that the explosion was one of the most violent that could occur. So powerful was the explosion that the shock, like the trembling of an earthquake, was felt in some of the stores in Broadway, a distance, in a direct line, of about a quarter of a mile, and was probably felt at a greater distance. The floors of Messrs. Hull & Sons' building were lifted up, and the thick walls, both those adjoining Mr. Taylor's establishment and those fronting on the next street, were bulged considerably, although built of unusual thickness, with reference to the possibility of fire or other contingency.

But the most awful part of this calamity, is the sudden and unwarned destruction of a large number of workmen employed in the machine shop and a hat manufactory which occupied the upper part of the premises.

The number of persons in the building at the time of the explosion was about 140, of whom 67 were killed.

Almost instantly after the explosion a large force of firemen, police and citizens set to work to extricate the sufferers, though from the rapid spread of the fire, this was a labor of great danger and difficulty. Nevertheless, a few were got out immediately, and the groans and voices of others far under the ruins stimulated to the most herculean exertions. Of some fifteen earliest rescued, only one was dead.

Shortly after the explosion, Mayor Woodhull, though in very feeble health, arrived on the ground, where he remained hard at work until nearly dark. He instantly gave orders for all the men of the Police, and others who could do any good, to be set at work to remove the ruins. He also ordered relays of men to work through the night, and sent a number of carts to assist in carrying off the rubbish. Provisions were got for the men, so that they might not lose a minute from work while a timber remained that could hide a body.

Mr. Matsell, Chief of Police was also at work all day, assisted by nearly all the Captains in the city, and large platoons of men, who were frequently relieved.

The work of exhumation has been continued all the week with unwearied exertion under the direction of His Honor the Mayor, Police Chief Matsell, the Common Council Committee, and the heroic Fire Department. Gangs of men were in reserve to take the place of those who got weary, and all expedition was used.

The crowd and excitement about the place has been very great—and the scenes of heart-rending agony on the part of the friends and relatives of the dead was truly appalling. At the various Station Houses in the vicinity the painful spectacles beggar all description.

Nearly a score of mangled and horribly disfigured bodies were lying at one time in an empty house adjoining.

Some have had life at once crushed out, their heads being a shapeless mass; others seem to have endured intense agony before their spirits departed.

Only a few could be recognized by their blackened and disfigured features, but generally the remnants of their garments was all that enabled their anxious and weeping friends to know them.

So painful was the scene, and so touching the agony of the poor women who bent over the mutilated remains, to discover by some shred of clothing whether a son, husband or brother lay before them, that even the Police, accustomed to sights of suffering, shed tears and grew sick at heart.

The following is the result of this terrible explosion:

Whole number dead	67
Whole number injured	30
Whole number escaped	32
Whole number missing	6
Total	135

Truly a more disastrous accident has never afflicted our City, nor one which so strongly calls for sympathy and assistance to the suffering friends of the Wounded and the Dead.

—LOSS OF THE STEAMER RHODE ISLAND—AND PROBABLE LOSS OF LIFE.—The Dailies of this morning announce that the Steamer Rhode Island, formerly running between New York and Stonington, and which sailed from this port on the 25th ult. for San Francisco, was lost at sea when three days out,—nine only out of forty-four persons on board, escaping. These escaped in an open boat and were picked up by a schooner.—When the vessel was last seen those on board were endeavoring to construct a raft from the wreck, but from its fast sinking condition it is feared they were unable to save themselves.

—SUIT TO ANNUL FREE PAPERS.—We find the following in the *New Orleans Delta*: "In all the Southern States, 'suits for freedom,' as they are termed, are common, and excite no remark. Numerous cases occur in 'the books,' where negroes and colored persons, held in Slavery, have claimed and recovered their freedom in the courts of justice. But suits to enslave, to reduce to bondage a negro, or colored person, who has been living as a free person, are somewhat rare. A case of the latter kind occurred a day or two ago, in the Fifth District Court, before a Jury, and occupied several days. It was the suit of 'A. F. Dunbar, Syndic of Theophilus Freeman, *vs.* Theophilus Freeman and Sarah Conner.' The plaintiff, as Syndic, sues for the purpose of annulling the act of emancipation made by Freeman to Sarah Conner, on various grounds of alledged fraud and collusion. The verdict of the Jury was 'for the plaintiff, which practically reduces Sarah to Slavery, so that she may be sold with the other property surrendered by Freeman to his creditors, unless the Supreme Court reverse the verdict.

—THE *Boston Daily Advertiser* publishes the following extract from a letter by an American of high standing in Berlin, who, after speaking of some not very reputable conduct of Americans in Germany, proceeds:

"But all things are tame beside our Minister, Hannegan. He is the most mannerless and utterly vulgar man I ever met. Though now recovering, he has during a considerable time been almost dying of *delirium tremens*. His presence here is the greatest possible disgrace to our country. I cannot here tell you about him; the stories which are current, and unhappily authenticated, surpass all belief. His manner and conversation are unendurable, his debauchery with women so g

Poetry.

THE CHILD'S GRAVE AT FLORENCE.

A. A. E. C. born July, 1848, *died November*, 1849.

BY ELIZABETH BARRETT BROWNING.

Of English blood,—of Tuscan birth,
What country should we give her?
—Instead of any on the earth,
The civic Heavens receive her.

And here, among the English tombs,
In Tuscan ground we lay her,
While the blue Tuscan sky endomes
Our English words of prayer.

A little child,—how long she lived,
By months, notyears, is reckoned:
Born in one July—she survived
Alone to see a second.

Bright-featured, as the July sun
Her little face still played in,—
And splendors, with her birth begun,
Had had no time for fading.

So LILY—from those July hours—
No wonder we should call her;
She looked such kinship to the flowers,—
Was but a little taller.

A Tuscan Lily,—only white;
As Dante, in abhorrence
Of red corruption, wished aright,
The lilies of his Florence.

We could not wish her whiter; her
Who perfumed with pure blossom
The house! a lovely thing to wear
Upon a mother's bosom!

This July creature thought perhaps
Our speech not worth assuming;
She sat upon her parents' laps,
And mimicked the gnat's humming.

Said—"Father, Mother,"—then, left off—
For tongues celestial, fitter!
Her hair had grown just long enough
To catch Heavens jasper glitter.

Babes! Love could always hear and see
Behind the cloud that hid them;
—"Let little children come to me,
And do not thou forbid them."

So, unforbidding, have we met,
And gently here have laid her;
Though winter is no time to get
The flowers that should o'erspread her.

We should bring pansies, quick with spring,
Rose, violet, daffodilly,
And also above everything,
White lilies for our Lily.

Nay, more than flowers this grave exacts,—
Glad, grateful attestations
Of her sweet eyes and pretty acts,
With calm renunciations.
Her very mother, with light feet
Should leave the place too earthy,
Saying,—"The angels have thee, sweet,
Because we are not worthy!"

But winter kills the orange-buds,
The gardens in the frost are;
And all the heart dissolves in floods,
Remembering we have lost her.

Poor earth,—poor heart! too weak, too weak
To miss the July shining;
Poor heart!—what bitter words *we* speak—
When God speaks of resigning!

Sustain this heart in us that faints,
Thou God, the self-existent!
—We catch up wild at parting saints,
And feel thy Heaven too distant.

The wind that swept them out of sin
Has ruffled all our vesture:
On the shut door that let them in
We beat with frantic gesture:—

To us,—us also open straight!
The outer life is chilly.
Are *we*, too, like the earth, to wait
Till next year for our Lily?

—O my own baby on my knees,
My leaping, dimpled treasure,—
At every word I write like these,
Clasped close, with stronger pressure!

Too well my own heart understands,—
At every word, beats fuller
—*My* little feet, my little hands,
And hair of Lily's color!

—But God gives patience: Love learns strength,
And Faith remembers promise,
And Hope itself can smile at length
On other hopes gone from us.

Love, strong as Death, can conquer Death,
Through struggle made more glorious:
This mother stills her sobbing breath,
Renouncing, yet victorious.

Arms empty of her child she lifts,
With spirit unbereaven:—
"God will not all take back His gifts,—
My Lily's mine in Heaven.

"Still mine—maternal rights serene
Not given to another!"
The crystal bars shine faint between
The souls of child and mother.

"Meanwhile," the mother cries, "content!"
"Our love was well divided:
Its sweetness following where she went,
Its anguish stayed where I did.

"Well done of God to halve the lot,
And give her all the sweetness!
To us,—the empty room and cot;
To her,—the Heaven's completeness.

"To us,—this grave; to her,—the rows
The mystic palm-trees spring in;
To us,—the silence in the house;
To her,—the choral singing!

"For her,—to gladden in God's view;
For us,—to hope and bear on:
Grow, Lily, in thy garden new,
Beside the rose of Sharon!

"Grow fast in Heaven, sweet Lily clipped,
In love more calm than this is;
And may the angels dewy-lipped
Remind thee of our kisses!

"While none shall tell thee of our tears,—
These human tears now falling:
Till, after a few patient years,
One Home shall take us all in:

"Child, father, mother—who, left out!
—Not mother, and not father!—
And when their dying couch about
The natural mists shall gather,

"Some smiling angel close shall stand,
In old Correggio's fashion,
Bearing a LILY in his hand
For Death's ANNUNCIATION."

—*London Athenæum.*

O EXECRABLE son, so to aspire,
Above his brethren, he himself assuming
Authority usurped from God, not given.
—Man over men
He made not lord; such title to Himself
Reserving, human left from human free.
—*Milton.*

Miscellany.

REVELATION OF HORRORS.

THE following is taken from a work by Eugene Regnault, entitled *The Criminal History of the English Government*. The passage relates to the conduct of our aristocratic tyrants towards the Americans during the unrighteous war waged with that people in 1776. It will be seen by my readers, that the Americans have some good reasons for preferring Republicanism to the rule of our English Aristocracy. It may also serve to show, what the friends of Reform have to expect from their aristocratic tyrants, if they should ever go so far as to shake without utterly destroying, the tyrant rulers under which they live. It will be seen, that when the English Aristocrats found it impossible to carry on the war and to conquer the Americans by what is generally considered the arts of *honorable* warfare, they privately bribed the Indian savages to murder, by every means in their power, as many Americans as possible, and actually engaged to give them so much a piece for every American scalp. The English generals thus carried on a regular trade with the Indians in human heads. The following document is a letter sent by Captain Crawford to Colonel Haldiman, the British Governor of Canada, accompanying eight packs of scalps:—

'May it please your excellency at the request of the Seneca chiefs, I send, herewith, to your excellency, under care of James Boyd, eight packs of scalps, cured and dried, hooped and painted with all the Indian triumphal marks, of which the following is invoice and explanation:

'Pack 1. Containing forty-three scalps of Congress soldiers, killed in different skirmishes; these are stretched on black hoops, four inches in diameter; the inside of the skin is painted red, with a small black spot to denote their being killed with bullets. Also, sixty-two of farmers, killed in their houses, the skin painted brown and marked with a hoe; a black circle all round, to denote their being surprised in the night, and a black hatchet in the middle, signyfying their being killed with that weapon.

'2. Containing ninety-eight farmers, killed in their houses: hoops red; figure of a hoe to mark their profession; great white circle and sun, to show they were surprised in the day time; *a little red foot*, to show they stood upon their defence, and died fighting for their lives and families.

'3. Containing ninety-seven farmers, hoops green, to show that they were killed in their fields; a large white circle with round mark in it for the sun, to show that it was in the day time; black bullet mark on some—hatchet on others.

'4. Containing one hundred and two of farmers, mixed of the several marks above, only eighteen marked with a little yellow flame, to denote their being of prisoners *burnt alive*. after being scalped, their nails pulled out by the roots, and other torments; one of these latter is supposed to be a rebel clergyman, his band being fixed to the hoop of his scalp. Most of the farmers appear by the hair to have been young or middle aged men; there being, but sixty-seven very gray heads among them all; which makes the service the more essential.

'5. Containing eighty-eight scalps of women; hair long, braided in the Indian fashion, to show they were mothers; hoops blue; skin yellow ground with little red tadpoles, to represent, by way of triumph, the tears of grief occasioned to their relations: a black scalping-knife or hatchet at the bottom, to mark their being killed with those instruments; sixteen others, hair very gray, black hoop; plain brown color, no mark but the short club, or casse-tete, to show they were knocked down dead or had their brains beat out.

'6. Containing one hundred and ninety-three boys' scalps, of various ages; small green hoops; whitish ground on the skin, with red tears in the middle, and black bullet marks; knife, hatchet, or club, as their deaths happened.

'7. Two hundred and eleven girls scalped, big and little; small yellow hoops, white ground; tears, hatchet, club, scalping-knife, &c.

'8. This package is a mixture of all the varieties above mentioned to the number of one hundred and twenty-two, with a box of birch bark, containing twenty-nine little infants' of various sizes—small white hoops, with white ground.

'With these packs the chiefs send to your excellency the following speech, delivered by Coneiogatchie in council, and interpreted by the elder More, the trader, and taken down by me in writing:

'Father, we send you herewith many scalps, that you may see we are not idle friends.

'Father, we wish you to send these scalps over the water to the great king, that he may regard them and be refreshed, and that he may see our faithfulness in destroying his enemies, and be convinced that his presents have not been made to an ungrateful people.'

These odious practices of the English Government were condemned with indignation by Lord Chatham. 'Behold,' said he 'the allies of England: the butchers of lower Saxony.—the Mohawks. the most cruel of men; brigands who respect neither age nor sex, and who delight in the blood of disarmed weakness. Alas! by mingling the tomahawk with the sword, the knife with the gun, we have stained our arms with a blot which all the waters of the ocean cannot efface!'

These packs of scalps and the letters accompanying them were found among the baggage of the English army after the defeat of General Burgoyne. The Americans preserved these sad remains of their murdered brethren, as a mark of the ferocity of their royal and aristocratic enemies.

Could my readers have believed it possible for men, professing to be wiser and better than their fellowmen, to be guilty of such horrible, such diabolical inhumanity? The Aristocrats who now rule over this country, are as bad in principle, and as diabolical in character, as their forefathers who warred so unrighteously and inhumanly with the friends of liberty in America. In their conduct towards Ireland they have been guilty of the greatest and most grievous of crimes that it is possible for men to commit. They have not exactly hired men to kill the Irish with the battle-axe or the tomahawk,—they have not exactly offered a reward for every Irish scalp; but they have, out of love of gain, devoted the Irish, by hundreds of thousands, even by millions, to a life and to a death more painful, more intolerable, than the tortures and death inflicted by the Indians. I repeat it, a curse, a heavy and eternal curse rests upon our tyrants. And as sure as there is righteousness on earth or justice in the heavens, so sure will a terrible destruction come upon this bloody and infernal set of men.—*J. Barker in 'The People.'*

ANOTHER REVELATION OF HORRORS.—In their war with the Americans in 1776 and 1777, the English tyrants employed a number of soldiers belonging to the Prince of Hesse Cassel. The English tyrants engaged to give the Prince of Hesse Cassel so much a piece for every soldier of his who was killed in their service. It will be seen from the following letter that this Prince of Hesse Cassel, this foreign Aristocrat, was as reckless of the lives of his soldiers,—nay, was eager, in fact, to convert their life and blood into gold, as the English tyrants who hired his soldiers were, to annihilate the friends of liberty in America. The following is a part of a letter he wrote to Hohendorff with respect to the fate of the men whom he had hired out to the British Aristocrats. It shows with what coolness, or rather with what pleasure, he could hear of the death of his soldiers, when contemplating the sums he was entitled to receive in consideration of their death:

'*Baron Hohendroff*:—I received at Rome, on my return from Naples' your letter of the 27th of December last. I learned with inexpressible pleasure the courage displayed by my troops at Trenton, and you cannot imagine my joy at reading, that of nineteen hundred and fifty Hessians who were engaged in the battle, only three hundeed escaped. There were then just sixteen hundred and fifty slain, and I cannot sufficiently commend your prudence in sending a correct list of the slain to my agent in London. This precaution was more necessary, because the list sent to the English minister stated that only fourteen hundred and fifty-five were killed.

'In this way I should lose one hundred and sixty thousand and fifty florins. According to the account of the lord of the treasury, there would come to me only four hundred and eighty-three thousand four hundred and fifty florins, instead of six hundred and forty-three thousand five hundred florins, which I have a right to demand according to our agreement.

'You will understand how seriously my finances would be effected by an error in the calculation, and you will therefore take the utmost pains to prove that your list is correct and that his is wrong. The British court objects that there were a hundred wounded, for whom they ought not to pay the price of dead men; but I hope that you remember the advice I gave you on your departure from Cassel, and that you have not attempted to restore to life those who could be saved only by depriving them of a leg or an arm. Life would be a fatal present to them, and I am sure that they would prefer to die with glory, rather than to live mutilated and not in a condition to serve me. I do not wish them to be sacrificed; you must be humane, my dear baron; but you can hint to the surgeons that a maimed man is a disgrace to their skill, and that it is a deed of charity to permit a warrior to die when he is not in a condition to fight. Farther, I am about to send you numerous recruits; do not spare them; remember that glory excels all things. Glory is true riches. You think then only of honor and reputation, but this reputation must be gained amid danger. Remember that of three hundred Lacedemonians who defended the defile of Thermopylæ, not one returned.

'Finally be careful to avoid any decisive action; for it is against my interests thas thit war should terminate. I am about making arrangments at Naples for the large Italian opera.'

And shall these wretches rule the earth for ever? Shall these cruel, most infernal dealers in the life and blood of their fellow-men, continue their dark deeds of blood and imfamy unchecked, unopposed? Can rational and virtuous men continue longer at ease beneath their irksome and inhuman sway? Let the people of England answer. For myself, I must either see these tyrants deposed, or leave the regions that they are permitted to curse, and seek a home and a dwelling elsewhere.

The Americans, with all their faults and imperfections, deserve eternal honor for their noble conduct in freeing shemselves from the oppressions of those tyrants. Let us hope that the day is not far distant, when the Americans of the present day will be enabled to destroy the tyranny of Great Britian and Ireland, and to aid the annihilation of royal and aristocratic oppression in every part of the world. —*Ibid.*

THE 'ANTI-CAPITAL PUNISHMENTS' HUMBUG.

THE latest product of the spirit of Humbug is the "Anti-Capital Punishments Movement," on which a few words may be well in place now; all the more so beeause, as we hear, it is extending itself to this part of the world: and the hanging of murderers is soon to be declaimed against, from the platform of practical Manchester.

Logic, reasoning, eloquence, philanthropic statement, are all good; they appeal to the human mind and receive their answer and confirmation from it. We venture to say, that in a region of human mind, far deeper than that into which any of these penetrate, there is an instinct which approves of, nay that commands, the hanging of murderers; an instinct old as the human race, and which can perish only with it. In earlier and ruder ages, the man that killed your relative and friend was killed by you; with what Bacon calls, the "wild-justice" of "revenge." As the ages have become more civilized, that primeval instinct has not diminished; only its mode of action has been altered. Society now says, (and properly says,) "The man who has killed your friend is not to be killed by *you* with the wild justice of revenge. *We* will kill him for you with the tamed and better ordered justice of legal procedure. "In the blind heat of resentment," says Society "You may kill the wrong man, and provoke new revenge against yourself. We will do the job for you; we will try the accused formally and deliberately; we will examine witnesses: we will give him a man with a wig to palaver his best for him. If, after all that, he is found guilty, we shall send him off from the earth, which his presence disgraces; and the responsibility (for all mistakes) will rest with *us* not with *you*."

"If these philanthropists," a young friend writes, —"if these phtlanthropists succeed in abolishing capital punishments by law, they will but reintroduce the older and wilder methods—I can tell them that. If the murderer is no longer to be executed by society, the mob. extemporizing some swift method of mob-trial, will rend him limb from limb. If these philanthropists succeed in abolishing capital punishments by law, and any one dear to me is murdered, my own hands will (if they but can) take speedy vengeance on the murderer—I can tell the philanthropists that.

"Is it," this friend proceeds, "is it a genuine reverence for human life—a respect for what is sacred and worthy in human life—that brings these oratorical philanthropists to their "Anti-Capital-Punishments" Platforms? If so, there is in England suffering enough—ending in unjust death, too,—there is suffering enough that has *not* murdered—to engage these gentlemens' sympathy and effort. How curious to find a man whose hard eyes drop tears over the offscourings of the race swinging on their well-merited gallows: and who yet refuses (because the ghost of something called 'Political Economy' forbids) to put a spade into the hands of the famished Irish peasant, and bid him dig and live.—*The (Manchester, Eng.) Inspector.*

EXTRACTS

FROM J. BARKER'S JOURNAL IN 'THE PEOPLE.'

AMERICAN PRODUCTS.—The next day we passed through Van Buren, a city with four or five log houses;—Carlisle, a beautiful, clean-looking, and snugly and pleasantly situated village, with perhaps a hundred houses;—Periopolis, which we approached by one of the roughest, hilliest, and most roundabout roads that ever mortal made, or ever mortal trod, was another city, of some ten or a dozen habitations, mostly log ones. From the rough roads along the steep hills, you can see how easily the road might have been made along the valley, so as to have made it about one half shorter. and a dozen times easier. From Periopolis we proceeded by a much better, and, on the whole, a very pleasant and easy road, much of it on the side of a creek and under the shade of lofty trees, to Hiramsburgh, where we called at an Inn to dine. It was kept by two females, mother and daughter. They soon got us a most comfortable meal, and charged us only ten cents each. Only think; we had apples, peaches, honey, bread and butter, milk, cheese, radisnes, pickles, and I know what, for fivepence, English, each. I said radishes; but we had only *one* radish, cut into four pieces down the middle; and it was plenty. They showed me, at my request, the radishes growing in the garden. Many of them were as big as common beet roots in England, and one I saw that was nearly as thick as my thigh. Cobbett says that he raised a radish on Long Island, two feet ten inches round. I have no doubt he *did*. Radishes grow to an enormous size here, and yet they are good when they are young.

In the morning we came to a peach orchard, and asked the owner if he would sell us a few peaches. 'You can *get* some,' he replied. My brother went to get some, and the man helped him; but he would not take pay for them. We gave one of his children a trifle. We got about a quarter or one-third of a peck, and they served us till nearly dinner time.—After dinner we came to another peach orchard, and asked the mistress, who was carrying a lot to the dry-house to dry, if she would sell us a few. 'You can get some to eat, but we don't sell them,' she replied. She showed us where the best and heaviest trees stood, and we got about two-thirds of a peck, which served us till the next day noon. The trees were literally weighed down to the ground with peaches. I never saw such a crop of fruit in my life. And oh, they were exceedingly delicious. We should not have taken so many at one place, but we had found that the season for them was nearly over. In nine out of ten of the orchards, the fruit had been gathered; so we were obliged to take them where we could get them. And the people in this country think nothing of a peck or a bushel of peaches.—They allow them to lie on the ground by bushels at a time, in plentiful seasons. There is no end to fruit here. The orchards are generally from an acre to ten acres large, and the trees in general bear abundantly.

AMERICAN HABITS.—I saw but one man in the train in which I travelled from Cincinnati who made much dirt with spitting. The filthiest scenes I saw were in the emigrant trains, and the filthiest people in the United States, in my opinion, are not Americans, but foreigners. The filthiest scenes I ever did see, I saw in the emigrant trains, among German emigrants. The worst tobacco chewers, and the worst tobacco smokers that I saw in the States, were Germans. As I went from Albany to Buffalo, a German woman who sat near to me, drank whisky or brandy till she was drunk. She then professed to be ill of the cholera or some similar complaint, but I cannot describe what followed. As soon as I saw what was coming, I fled to the former part of the carriage and opened the carriage door, and there I stood, with my back to the rest of the passengers. It was not long, however, before I found that as many of the passengers as could had followed my example, though but few of them found it possible to get as far off from the occasion of the offence as myself. Some would have taken occasion from an affair like this to revile the Americans.

I more than once rebuked the filthy spitters, yet I never got seriously insulted. As I was coming from New Buffalo to Detroit, I got seated besides clean and decent people, and put my carpet bag under the seat before me. At length one of my clean companions left the carriage, and another took his place. The new comer turned out to be a horrid tobacco chewer, and a filthy, wholesale spitter. He had not sat long, before he had made a ditch that was beginning to run in the direction of my bag: so I took up my bag and placed it on my knees and said; 'The nasty, filthy habit: I wish every tobacco chewer was obliged to lick up his own spittle.' 'This is a free country,' said the filth-producer. 'Then a man may take the liberty of stating his opinions about people's habits,' I replied. He made no reply, but took an opportunity shortly after, of getting a seat at some distance from me.

I came from Detroit to Cleveland in a splendid steamer, and, as I had got a cold, and wanted a good night s sleep in a comfortable bed, I took my place in the first cabin. I had not been long by the cabin stove, before a man who sat near me began spitting every few seconds on the grate and the sides of the stove, though there were spittoons on both sides of him. I said at length, 'There's a spittoon, see, there.' The moment I spoke, the stewardess, a fine colored woman, pushed a spittoon right under his nosé, and gave him one of the most terrible frowns I ever saw. The fellow seemed confounded with this double and unlooked for rebuke, and instantly slunk away.

FALSE MODESTY.—What writers on America have said about the disagreeable false modesty of American women is too true. I scarcely ever saw an American woman who could look and speak and act with that natural and comfortable freedom so visible in the women of other countries. Most of the American women that I saw seemed afraid either to look or speak or move in the presence of men. And it is next to impossible for an Englishman to avoid shocking them, if he talks much in their hearing. He must never say anything about the males of fowls, without using some new or round-about form of expression. He may talk about *hens*, but if he should use the old English form in speaking of the hens' *husbands*, he would probably find that he had committed an unpardonable offence. Even the use of such a word as '*cock-fighting*' would be too much for the mock or morbid modesty of many. HENS are allowed to be *hens*, but cocks must always be *roosters*. 'Then what must we call the PEACOCK,' said I to a person who was giving me instruction on those delicate subjects,—'must we call it a pea-rooster?' The company laughed, and my instructor joined in the laugh, and said, 'We should say the male of the pea fowl.'

In the neighborhood of Cuyahoga Falls you never hear a woman called Mrs. such-a-one. Every woman, whether married or single is called MISS. Old women with husbands, children and grand-children, are all *Misses*. I was astonished, after hearing people talk of *Miss* Hoog, and forming the image of some fair and youthful maiden, to find that Miss Hoog was an elderly widow lady, with a married son or daughter. The word mistress is discarded, I suppose, on account of one of the significations it has had the misfortune to acquire.

PROFANITY.—One thing that astonished me and disgusted me exceedingly, was the *language* of certain classes in America. I never, in any country, heard such horrible and endless cursing and swearing. Many seemed as if they could not utter a sentence without an oath or imprecation. Everything was 'God-damned' good, or 'God-damned' bad, or 'God-damned' something. 'God-damned' appeared to be an almost universal adjective, expressing every possible quality of every imaginable thing. The more moderate would only describe things as devilish good, or devilish bad; but most would describe things by the former and more offensive adjective. This horrible and disgusting kind of talk prevailed chiefly among the tavern-goers; but it frequently forced itself upon my ears in other company. I heard some who, literally, never uttered a sentence without some such word or phrase as God, devil, hell, damnation, bloody, God-damned, devilish, or tarnation; not a single sentence. Some will imagine that I am exaggerating here; but I am doing no such thing: I am uttering the simple, literal truth. One man that I heard mixed so many of those offensive words with every sentence, as frequently to render himself utterly unintelligible. And they use this horrible kind of language, not merely when they are vexed or drunk, but when they are perfectly calm and sober. It is a common and unvarying ingredient of their conversation. In some cases it seems to be the *principal* ingredient. I have frequently heard drunkards, profligates, dog-fighters and the like curse and swear in England; but the worst kind of talk I ever heard from the most miserable wretches I ever saw in England, was rational and holy, compared with the horrid and endless flow of oaths and curses which I frequently heard in America. I have heard more obscene and filthy expressions and allusions perhaps in England than in America; but I never heard such a rattle and jumble of senseless oaths and curses. As I have said, we encountered this disgusting kind of talk chiefly at taverns, *town* taverns; though it frequently came upon us in other places. How *large* the class of persons addicted to this wretched and irrational kind of talk may be, I cannot tell. I should take it to be considerable in some parts of the country. Nor can I tell exactly what *kind* of persons those offensive and revolting talkers are in other respects; but I should judge from the subjects of their conversation among each other, that they were, in general, drunkards, gamblers, fighters, &c. I should also judge, that a great proportion of them were Dutchmen and Germans. I know that many of them were. Many of them were *young* persons. I never visited the New England States. My remarks refer chiefly to New York, certain parts of Ohio and Chicago. I may further observe, that I think the use of the offensive language I am reprobating, must be rather common, from the fact, that I had not only heard it occasionally from persons who appeared to be, in general, intelligent and respectable, but sometimes heard *variations* of some of the offensive terms even among decent people. Many that will not say '*damned*, or *damnation*,' will say '*darned*' or '*tarnation*.' Of course, all the cursing and swearing in the world are not, in themselves, as bad as robbing the poor, persecuting the innocent, or starving the laboring classes to death; still, they are bad, and foolish, and they are often indicative of other vices. It is better for people to have a foul outside and a clean inside, than a foul inside and a fair outside: but it is best for all people to have both outside and inside clean. And though there are persons who, like eastern graves, appear fair outwardly, while they are inwardly full of all uncleanness; there are not very many who are foul and offensive outwardly, that are clean and sound within.

CASTE.—At Springfield three colored persons took their seats in the carriage in which I was. The conductor, however, spoke to them, and they followed him out. At the next station I looked for the negro carriage, but could see none; so I concluded the poor colored creatures had been denied a passage altogether. I afterwards learned that they had been put into a small side-room, in the carriage in which I myself was. I went to look for them and to speak to them; but they had left the train. They seemed to me to be preachers or lecturers of some kind. One of them had a newspaper in his hand, which looked, as he passed me, a good deal like W. L. Garrison's *Liberator*. As I came from Cincinnati to Sandusky, the conductor refused a fine and intelligent looking colored man, a place in the train. The man tried to get in, but could not. He then spoke to the conductor, as if asking permission to go; but the train went off and left him. Some pretend that colored persons smell offensively; but this is not the reason of their exclusion from the railway carriages. They allow colored persons to act as servants to the company. The sub-conductor from Springfield to Cincinnati was a colored person. And a colored person was employed to carry water round to the passengers, on the way from Cincinnati to Sandusky I ought to have observed, that on the Sandusky and Cincinnati line, a person goes round every hour or two with a large tin kettle and two tumbler glasses, to deal out clear, cold water to all who may wish to drink.

On the Cincinnati and Sandusky line I saw no second class carriages. All were first class. The fare was ten shillings and sixpence, English, for eighty-four miles, and twenty-seven shillings and three-pence for two hundred and thirty-four miles; about three-halfpence a mile. On the *Emigrant* lines of railway there are *two* classes; and there *may* be two classes on some *other* lines, I do not know. How long it is since second class carriages were first employed in the States, I do not know. The second class carriages, so far as I have seen them, are dry and comfortable. I always ride in them myself, both for the sake of travelling cheaply, and getting into the company of emigrants, and obtaining information from them.

INCIDENTS.—Before I take my leave of the past, I must give you a few particulars respecting our journey. And first: I told you that the man at whose house we stopped at Sistersville, was at the prayer meeting when we got there. He was a professor of religion. Yet he charged us one-third more than the usual charge, though his accommodations were worse than usual. My brother too observed that the horse, when he put it into the gig, appeared to have fared even worse than ourselves. My brother's opinion is, that the fellow robbed the poor horse as well as us. This was the only time we ever had reason to think the poor horse had been cheated.

On our way to Mr. Underwood's we ventured on a new road that turned out to be not quite finished. The man through whose grounds the road ran, complained loudly, and bade us turn back. We reasoned with the man, and urged him to allow us to proceed, as we had intended no trespass, and as it was difficult to go back. He however was inexorable. We hesitated for awhile what to do, and at length went on There was however no way back into the old road, but down a private road belonging to this man. To prevent us from getting that way, he took his axe, and ran and closed the gate, and stood with his axe on his shoulder to guard it. I reasoned with him again; disclaimed all intention of trespass or offence in taking the new road, and besought him to allow us to proceed. No. I reasoned again. But, No; we should not go that way in defiance of him. 'Well,' said I, at length, 'we have no disposition to attempt to force our way; so if you persist in refusing us the favor of passing through your gate, we shall return the way we came.' So I got out to turn the conveyance. As soon as I had got the horse half turned round he said, 'Well, you may go.' Thus ended our first and only dispute during the whole of our journey. The man was a mean fellow, or he never would have attempted to turn us back; as we were doing no harm to any one, and gave him every assurance that we had got wrong through a perfectly innocent mistake. He however gave way the moment we yielded and prepared to return.

On our *return* from Mr. Underwood's, on Sunday morning, we found a poor fellow, with a wagon and two horses, and a load of goods, set fast in a most dangerous part of the road. He was coming down the hill with his load, when the front of his wagon gave way, and the barrels and bags &c., with which he was loaded, rolled out against the horses' heels, frightening the poor animals almost out of their wits. How he contrived to compose the poor horses and prevent them from galloping off,—and how he succeeded in preventing his barrels from rolling off the road down the steep hill side into the glen below, I know not. He had a narrow escape. He was in a terrible position. The road was exceedingly steep; and it ran along the side of a hill much steeper. The road was narrow too; and there was no fence of any kind. And there the poor fellow stood when we got up, sweating and fearful and despairing, anxiously holding his horses. We set to work and helped him in with his barrels, &c., which he never could have got in without help. And how long he might have waited in that terrible plight, in that lonely and perilous place, before *other* help could have come, no one can tell. The man seemed exceedingly thankful for our help, and asked us if we would accept of anything to drink. We told him we were teetotalers, and recommended teetotalism to him. He said he did not drink much; and I told him I believed he did not, for his face seemed too healthy and fresh for a great drinker. He said he was very much obliged to us; and we told him that we were very glad we had been able to help him, and added, that the only return we wished was, that whenever he met with any in similar difficulty, he would help *them*.

At Sistersville we saw the professing Innkeeper; but as we had no desire either to be overcharged, or to have our poor dumb animal defrauded, we passed his door, and dined at the house of one who appeared to be a *non*-professor. Our horse got well fed, and we had a tolerable dinner for Virginia, for the usual tavern charge of twenty-five cents for each man, and ten for the horse.

ON BOOKS WRITTEN FOR WOMEN.

BY GERALDINE E. JEWSBURY.

WE are not advocates for that tribe of works which have of late abounded, written for the express benefit of the female sex. Women seem to be regarded as patent blocks, upon which every new adaptation of law and duty may be tried with impunity. The "Missions of Women," the "Duties of Women," "Women as they should be," and the whole school of the "Women of England" books, are all unmitigated twaddle They only go to prove one thing, which is, that the condition-of-women question is in a very unsatisfactory state. The "Specifics," "Balsams," and "Infallible remedies," which in times of pestilence put forth their pretensions to save the world, only prove the general sickness of the community—and not that any new revelations in the art of healing have been given.

Women cannot be nourished on "Prepared Food," nor is it at all to their advantage to have their meat cut small and all the bones carefully removed, for fear they should be choked withal. The whole school of that literature, specially dedicated to the use of women, is worthless, and utterly inadequate for the purpose of nutrition to any female mind beyond confirmed idiotcy. Its products are absolute and unredeemed trash, where their faults are not of a graver die, by the inculcation of false morality and bad principles in a vehicle of washy sentimentality about female grace, and the "virtues that men most admire in women." One work which has been regarded as the mirror for young women, recommends the grace of "a gentle-toned voice" on this ground—and men are throughout made the ultimate court of appeal as to the becomingness or desirableness of every quality. The work in question goes on the principle of treating women as well-behaved *slaves*, useful and safe property to their husbands; a certain long-suffering inferiority, a trembling love, and unlimited obedience, are inculcated. Men are painted, selfish, egotistical, brutal, and yet to them obedience is preached as due; *because they are men*; no higher reason is asked or given. Hints abound as to the dexterity required "to manage them," the difficulty of making them have reason; their imbecility and arbitrariness are painted with a spirit which shews an extensive and unfortunate acquaintance with the "nobler gender;" but the collar of subjection is only the more firmly rivited on women for each folly or vice which might show how little right divine there is to exact it. Certainly the men gain little by all this servility; they are held up as a race peculiarly liable to be duped. "Managing a husband" is a fact distinctly recognised, as a sure and certain mode of success, and very faintly reprobated; the reprobation being as a feather's weight in the scale against the "success" poised in the other. All this is bad, is false, is disgusting; and yet the work in question is one which "husbands are recommended to buy for their wives, brothers for their sisters;" it keeps up its price, and numberless large editions of it have been sold and are now selling. God help women when such as these are their teachers!

What is the generation of women likely to arise from such teaching? Neither women nor children are to be written down to with impunity; their moral growth is distorted, is impeded—they become a generation of rickety, imbecile, dangerous beings,—dangerous because, inferior or equal to men as the case may be, they have an immense amount of power and influence, of which they cannot be deprived, and which they are utterly unfitted to exercise for the well-being of the human race. It seems to be considered that women require specially diluted instruction to meet their capacity. Botany for ladies, science for ladies, morality for women, are all intrinsically worse than worthless. Women do not need to have their knowledge diluted for them, like spirit so many degrees "below proof," but they do need before all things to be treated like rational beings, to be allowed morally as well as physically plenty of fresh air and exercise; they need to learn whatever their time, talents, or means enable them to learn; thoroughly and unaffectedly to be taught as men are taught, like rational human beings, and not as female specialities.

It would provoke laughter, if the results were not so fatal, to see how women have their "views," their "principles," their "duties," and their mode of conduct dictated to them, as if "that little world, made cunningly," the human heart of one entire half of humanity, were as easily to be tracked in all its windings and recesses as the labyrinth of the Rosherville Gardens. It is a great mercy that it is 'He from whom no secrets are hid" who at the last day will judge women—and not any poor phrase-making human being.

Women have always been cruel to each other. Men have not particularly well succeeded in following the apostle's injunction to "love as brethren," but they live amongst each other like turtle doves, compared to the sisterhood of women. The reason is that women are trained to lead an entire *relative* life, and they are slenderly endowed with moral courage. They depend upon what is thought of them, and dare not be strong in their own convictions; therefore the temptation to enhance themselves and find favor with their masters, at the expense of other women.

The law of morality will never be complete until women ceasing from traditions, shall utter what is the conviction of their own consciences. Hitherto men have made laws, men have been public opinion, and women have had to accede to both under heavy penalties for heresy. "The fear of men bringeth a snare," as one of the old prophets emphatically said long ago. This fear is peculiarly ensnaring for women, and until they can see and feel, and respect their own consciences, they cannot adequately discharge the sacred duties which have been appointed to them as wives and mothers.

Women are the household gods—the true Lares and Penates—from whom all home influences and fire-side blessings distil.

The home in which women dwell is *not* an inferior state to that world lying beyond, into which men go forth to work, to legislate, and to make money. "The things which are seen are not made of those which do appear," and taken only as dead material, the shops and warehouses, and business of men, are as circumscribed and poor as that material of houses, servants, and domestic routine, out of which women have to manufacture their lives. The true value of life is not in the multitude of material things, but in the living spirit which pervades the material facts; inspiring the most common duties with a meaning beyond what can be uttered. There is a side in the life-occupations both of men and women which stretches away from "the ignorant present," and unites theirs to the divine and infinite life in which we "live and move and have our being." Every duty, however trivial, that is honestly done, is not the mere fact of a thing done, but is the attempt to realize the idea that dwells in the heart of all, and which inspires the desire to do all that "the hand findeth to do." It is this ideality which makes the essential difference between what is noble and what is sordid. It dwells equally in low duties as in high destinies; it is this aspiration which "magnifies our life" and "makes it honorable."

The destinies of men and women touch each other, but do not circumscribe each other; each have their own life springing up within them, and it is their own individual life which women need to be taught to recognize and to reverence; and not go through their work with "eye service as men pleasers."

Women are before all things MOTHERS; to them is committed the whole cradle-time of humanity. It is *their* teaching, their impress, which is given to the generation about to inherit the future. It earnestly concerns women to keep their inner life free from mean aims and unworthy thoughts, that they may go on from strength to strength, and accomplish the work which is given them to do.

Gleanings from Foreign Publications.

——RAJAH BROOKE AND HIS DOINGS—The attention of the House of Commons will, next session, be drawn to the late horrible slaughter of from 1,500 to 2,000 of the Sarebas tribe on the *fiat* of the Rajah of Sarawak. Mr. J. Hume, M. P., in a letter to the *Daily News*, says, "A public meeting ought to be held in London, and the execration of all right-thinking men ought to be expressed against such wholesale destruction—perhaps of innocent and unoffending people. That meeting would bring forth the truth, and clear the people of England from the charge."

——A FOOLISH consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds. "If you would be a man, speak what you think to-day, and to-morrow speaks what to-morrow thinks, though you shall contradict all you have said to-day." Here is a maxim of philosophy, it would be well for the world to see boldly acted up to. In politics, how much mischief would be avoided, had men the courage to act always on the convictions of the hour. How much obstinate perseverance in what is wrong would be spared the witnessing, if the bugbear "consistency" did not haunt men as it does. "There are many persons acquire to themselves a character of insincerity, from what is in truth mere inconstancy. And there are persons of changeable passions, perhaps the sincerest of any on the instant they make profession, but the very least to be depended on through the short duration of all extremes."

——PRIZE OXEN AND THOSE WHO FED THEM.—The beast and his driver furnished us with some strange contrasts. The ox has been petted from his youth upwards. . . . The driver, sent into the world to be a slave of the ox, living in the foulest of dens, harrassed by day with the toil, by night with the anxiety of providing for the hunger (scarcely ever satisfied) of the next day: fed with the coarsest of food, of less value to his employer than the cattle, the implements, the bricks and mortar of the farm. Measured against the prize beast, the laborer's value shrinks into nothing. His parish would be but too glad to make a present of him, and a hundred like him, to any man or nation under the sun. What, however, must be his feelings if he is taken into the cattle-show? He will find thousands of lookers on, who discourse with rapture of the fat oxen, with unction and scientific precision on clovers, on oil-cake, and on everything which makes oxen fat; on everything except the poor human laboring machine—himself, and others like him, whose highest mission seems to be to form a cheap link of communication between the fat beast and the rich owner.—*Historic Times.*

——DESTRUCTION OF BOOKS.—"The destruction of books at various times exceeds all calculation: the earliest fact on record is related by Berosus: Nebonassar, who became King of Babylon 747 years before the Christian era, caused all the histories of the kings, his predecessors, to be destroyed: 500 years later, Chihoang Ti, Emperor of China, ordered all the books in the empire to be burnt, excepting only those which treated of the history of his family, of astrology, and medicine. In the infancy of Christianity many libraries were annihilated in various parts of the Roman empire: Pagans and Christians being equally unscrupulous in destroying their respective books In 890 the magnificent library contained in the Temple of Serapis was pillaged and entirely dispersed. Myriads of books have been burned in the frequent conflagrations at Constantinople: and when the Turkish troops took possession of Cairo, in the 11th century, the books in the library of the Caliphs (1,600,000 volumes) were distributed among the soldiers instead of pay, 'at a price,' says the historian, 'far below their value.' Thousands of the volumes were torn to pieces and abandoned on the outskirts of the city, piled in large heaps. The sand of the des